



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Ac. 971 e. $\frac{7}{1841}$

THE CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

PRINTED BY
L. AND G. SEELEY, THAMES DITTON, SURREY.

THE
CHURCHMAN'S
MONTHLY REVIEW.

MDCCCXLI.



PUBLISHED BY R. B. SEELEY AND W. BURNSIDE;
AND SOLD BY L. AND G. SEELEY,
FLEET STREET, LONDON.
MDCCCXLI.

ADVERTISEMENT.

It would, perhaps, have been the most natural course, for the present announcement to have appeared with the December number of the CHURCHMAN'S REVIEW. The simple truth, however, is, that at that period, drawn various ways by the variety of counsels that were offered, and of plans that suggested themselves, the Proprietors were not able absolutely to decide upon the course which they would, for the future, adopt. It is only within the last few days that they have been able to discern their course, and to make the arrangements which they now desire to announce.

Two deficiencies have been frequently pointed out, by the readers of the Churchman's Review; and to the supply of those short-comings the attention of the Proprietors will now be directed. The first was, the too brief and rapid manner in which, owing to the narrow limits of the Review, subjects of vast importance were frequently dismissed. The average length afforded to each Reviewer was twelve pages; and experience has shewn that this was, in many cases, an injurious limitation. The first change, therefore, will be the extension of these limits, by the necessary enlargement of the publication itself.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Another desideratum was, a really good and complete digest of all the Church Intelligence of the month. There is no publication which properly supplies this. The Ecclesiastical Gazette,—perhaps the best attempt of the kind, is so occupied by Documents, and by the Proceedings of two or three leading Societies, as to have no room for general and provincial intelligence. It is now, therefore, intended, to give, in about 20 or 30 pages of the Churchman's Review, monthly, a fuller and more perfect digest of the events of the month, especially relating to Church matters, than has yet been furnished by any existing publication.

By thus meeting the wishes of various classes of its supporters, the bulk of the CHURCHMAN'S REVIEW will be considerably increased: and as a necessary consequence, the price will be raised to eighteen-pence. It is the hope of the conductors that, profiting by the experience of the past year, they may be enabled to furnish such a publication as, when its intrinsic value is considered, will be generally admitted to be of worth equal to this charge.

The mere fact, also, of a Chronicle of Events being added, will account for the necessary change of the day of publication, from the *first* to the *last* day of each month. The events for January, 1842, it is obvious, can only be recorded when January is about to close.

They trust, too, that the present state and prospects of the Church will impress their friends with the necessity of zealously supporting such a publication as the Churchman's Review. Assuredly, it has scarcely ever been so needful “earnestly to con-

ADVERTISEMENT.

tend for the faith once delivered to the saints.” Few periods in the Church’s history have been marked by perils so fearful or so imminent. Such a crisis demands the best efforts of every one who may be able to contribute anything to the defence of the common cause ; and it calls also for the sympathy and *the earnest support of the Christian public*, to be willingly afforded to such as may offer themselves in the Church’s service. The Conductors of the CHURCHMAN’S REVIEW ask for that sympathy and that support. They need more general encouragement than they have yet received, and they cannot doubt that they shall obtain it. To all who rightly feel the momentous character of the contest which is now opening, they commend their undertaking, asking with confidence for their friendly aid in every way,—especially in the *most effectual* of all,—by which an effort of this kind can be supported and carried forward.

IT IS INTENDED TO PUBLISH,

ON JANUARY 31, 1842,

**THE CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW
AND CHRONICLE,**

FOR JANUARY, 1842;

PRICE 1s. 6d.

C O N T E N T S.

	PAGE
A Few Words to Churchwardens, &c.	626
Alison's Principles of Population	128
Ancient Christianity	199
Arnold's Sermons	421
 Baptismal Regeneration	 177
Beaven's Life of Irenæus	666
Beecham's Ashantee	436
Benson's Temple Discourses	457
Books for the Young	400
Bosanquet on the Romans	108
Bowden's Life of Gregory VII.	670
Brown's (Archdeacon) Charge	176
Bullar's Winter in the Azores	395
 Cambridge Pamphlets on Clerical Education	 481
Charge of the Bishop of Chester	681
Charge of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol	681
Colquhoun's Church of Scotland	153
 Daille on the Fathers	 612
 Faber's Cherwell Water Lily, &c. :	 33
Fulford's Progress of the Reformation	654

	PAGE
Gardiner's Visit to Chili	189
Gillmor's Unity of the Church	657
Gladstone's Church Principles	45
Graves' (Dean) Works	106
Gresley's Charles Lever	272
Gresley and Palmer on the Restoration of the Church	560
Gurney's Winter in the West Indies	14
 Hankinson's Seatonian Prize Poem	 110
Hare's (Archdeacon) Charge	112
Hare's (Archdeacon) Sermons	378
Harford's Life of Bishop Burgess	372
Hastings' (Lady Flora) Poems	115
Hawker's Ecclesia	169
Helen Fleetwood	165
Hook's Letter to the Bishop of Ripon	281
Hook's Scriptural Principles	117
 Jameson's Reformation in Navarre	 94
Jocelyn's Chinese Expedition	261
 Lay's Chinese as they are	 359
Lindsay's (Lord) Letter to a Friend	694
Lives of Breay and Housman	294
Lord on the College of Maynooth	239
 Madden on Slavery in Cuba	 701
Mackay's Hope of the World	167
Mariolatry	536
M'Causland on the Jewish Church	240, 362
M'Ilvaine on the Oxford Divinity	305
Memoir of Rev. C. T. E. Rhenius	332
Memoir of Mrs. Stevens	549
Memoir of Rev. W. Wilkinson	707
Milman's History of Christianity	53
Murray's History of the Irish Church	87
 Noel's Plea for the Poor	 521, 584

CONTENTS.

vii

PAGE

Objections to the Church Missionary Society answered	299
Paget's Tales of the Village	78
Paget's St. Antholin's	507
Palmer on Church Extension	601
Pastoral Annals	592
Personal Recollections by Charlotte Elizabeth	419
Poole's Life of Cyprian	136
Protestant Associations	541
Ranke's Lives of the Popes	69
Recollections of the Lakes	408
Religion the Strength of Conservatism	445
Robinson's Researches in Palestine	572
Scholefield's Scriptural Grounds of Union	173
Scott's Suppression of the Reformation in France	94
Sewell's Christian Morals	57
Sheppard's State of Religion in France	94
Shuttleworth on Justification	1
Sibthorp's Claims of the Catholic Church	657
Slavery in the United States	208
Strachan's Letter to Sir J. Hobhouse	144
Summer and Winter in the Pyrenees	474
Tate's History of St. Paul	324
Taylor's Natural History of Society	18
Taylor's (Isaac) Lectures	497
The Bishop	365
The Centurions	172
The Church Pastoral Aid Society	233
The Nestorians	479
The Prisoners of Australia	531
The Remnant Found	479
Tracts for the Times	241
Tvba Concordiæ	631
Tyler on the Invocation of Saints	220
Unitarianism Confuted	56

	PAGE
Ward's Defence of No. 90	383
Webster's Sermons	413
Whately's Kingdom of Christ	645
Wilberforce's (Archdeacon) Charge	99
Wilberforce's Five Empires	288
Wilson's Seven Sermons	56
Woodward on the Amusements of the World	348

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1841.

JUSTIFICATION THROUGH FAITH.—THE MERCIFUL CHARACTER OF THE GOSPEL COVENANT.—THE SUFFICIENCY OF SCRIPTURE AS A RULE OF FAITH. *Three Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford.* By PHILIP N. SHUTTLEWORTH, D.D., Warden of New College, &c. (now Lord Bishop of Chichester). *Rivingtons.* 1840.

WE have selected this unpretending, but most seasonable, volume, for the commencement of our critical labours, not only on account of the just reputation of the distinguished Writer, but because, on observing the subjects of the three discourses which it contains, and more especially the third, we hoped to find some remarks confirmatory of the principles on which the "*Churchman's Review*" will be conducted in accordance with its name. Nor have we been disappointed in this hope. The last of these sermons, entitled, '*The Sufficiency of Scripture as a Rule of Faith*,' enters deeply and fully into the proof of that proposition, which we have been accustomed to regard, and which we earnestly desire to recommend, as the basis of all true churchmanship—'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' (Article vi.) In strict conformity with this explicit and authoritative decision of the Church, 'the one proposition, (observes Bishop Shuttleworth,) which on the present occasion it is my object to maintain, is the admirable adaptation of the inspired writings to the average and more ordinary faculties of the human understanding—in other words, the

entire sufficiency and clearness of scripture as a means of salvation, to all who apply to it for that purpose, however deficient such persons may be in those higher attainments which come under the denomination of literature and philosophy.'—(p. 89.)

It is then, as we conceive, this recognition of the oracles of God—first, as a standard of faith, which all are under obligation to apply, and then, as a rule of practice from which none can be at liberty to depart;—that constitutes the prominent and distinctive feature in the character of the genuine Churchman. By this, we believe, he will be best enabled to avoid the two opposing extremes, towards which the errors, the extravagances, and we might say, the heresies of the present age converge; a faith unproductive of virtue, and a virtue unproduced by faith—on the one hand a meditative, contemplative, quiescent, stagnant religion, which dogmatizes in symbols, or evaporates in forms—on the other, a liberal or rather latitudinarian indifference to all creeds, which assumes that man is irresponsible for his opinions so long as he is (by his fellow man) irreproachable in his conduct—and which, applying the Poet's unceremonious designation of 'graceless zealots' to all who contend about 'modes of faith,' is hardy enough to aver

His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.

Either of these extremes, it is manifest, originates in the specious and too prevalent fallacy of taking a part for the whole; while the true and safe 'middle way' applies the spirit and tenor of the whole of Scripture as the test and touchstone of every system, which professes to comprehend a part. Thus we are equally preserved from diverging into error, or from stopping short of truth. For the negative proposition in the article of our Church necessarily implies the affirmative—that 'as nothing is an article of faith, or to be thought requisite and necessary to salvation which is *not* contained in Holy Scripture,' so every thing is an article of faith, and essential to be received, which is contained therein; in other words, that whatever of doctrine is taught by the oracles of God, claims the assent, or if need be, the submission of the understanding; and whatever of precept they inculcate demands the subjection of the will, the regulation of the conduct, and the obedience of the heart.

It is therefore of incalculable moment, first, that the foundation of our religious belief should be firmly laid, and then, that the limits of its practical obligation should be accurately and unalterably defined—that we should be enabled to distinguish by an unerring criterion between the revealed will and word of God, and the deductions, inferences, speculations, inventions, or 'superadditions' of man;—that 'substantial truths'—truths which involve the eternal

destinies of the recipient—should not only be accessible to the moral and spiritual perceptions of all whom they concern, but be presented in a form alike incapable of any error, and unsusceptible of any change. If it be an essential attribute of the nature of Deity, that “with Him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning,” so likewise the word which He hath spoken, being the transcript of that portion of His mind which He deems proper to communicate to man, must be assimilated to the character of Him who hath spoken it. Not only must it be “incorruptible, that liveth and abideth for ever;” but, being designed for the universal benefit of the whole intelligent creation, the statements which it unfolds, while such in substance as are undiscoverable by any, will be such in terms as shall be comprehensible by all. ‘Did not the Christian revelation contain truths and facts equally above the reach of the learned and ignorant to find out, it would not be a revelation—being intended for the instruction of all mankind in their moral, rather than in their strictly intellectual faculties, it cannot be supposed that its lessons would be conveyed in a manner to which those faculties would be unable to respond, or with which they could not fully sympathize.’ To the proposition, then, ‘that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation’ our Church virtually and practically superadds another—that all things necessary to salvation which Holy Scripture contains, are capable of being acquired, apprehended, and applied, by all who are admitted by baptism into her visible fellowship and communion—that, ‘even if we lack a learned man to instruct and teach us, yet God himself from above will give light into our minds, and teach us those things that be necessary for us, and whereof we are ignorant; and those things in the scripture that be plain to understand and necessary for salvation, every man’s duty (and therefore every man’s privilege) is to learn them, to print them in memory and effectually to exercise them. By that means in this world we shall have God’s defence, favour, and grace, with the unspeakable solace of peace, and quietness of conscience; and after this miserable life we shall enjoy the endless bliss and glory of heaven.’ (*Second Part of the Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture.*)

We return then to our portraiture of the true Churchman (the man to aid whose judgment and direct whose exercise of mind in the most important subjects our humble labours are especially designed) and having ascertained as its prominent and distinctive feature the *entire and unreserved acceptance of Holy Scripture as the supreme and exclusive authority in matters of faith*, we proceed to identify a second, which is naturally produced by, and inseparably associated with, the first—we mean, *the adoption of that exposi-*

tion, or rather application of Holy Scripture which is to be found in the accredited and authorized Formularies of the Anglican Church; her liturgy, her creeds, her articles, her homilies;—the two last, peculiar to herself—the two first, common to her with the ancient Catholic Church throughout the world. But it would be unreasonable in theory, as well as false in fact, to require further that in the majority of instances at least, this adoption should be the result of actual scrutiny and investigation. Ordinarily this process is reversed—the adoption of church principles, as a consequence of education, comes first, and the comparison or examination follows and confirms it. But that man is no less a genuine Churchman, who receives these formularies in youth on the authority which he is accustomed to respect, and whose faith is subsequently strengthened and ratified by the results of his own experience, and the perceptions of his own mind; than he who has been trained in hostility to the Church through ignorance of her real character, but who, when his faculties are matured by age, and sharpened by exercise—or, what is no unfrequent case, when his suspicions are excited by the bitter and gratuitous malignity of the adversaries of the Church, enters into the controversy for himself—applies to her articles, her liturgy, her ritual, the standard of scriptural truth; is surprised and attracted by her exact conformity with this only unerring test; and in the ardour of unexpected conviction; with the generous candour of one who confesses that he has done a wrong, and the honest zeal of one who hastens to repair it; throws himself into her willing embrace, and declares himself all her own. For in either case, the reason of adherence in the child whom she hath nourished, the principle of attachment in the convert whom she hath won, is the same. Both find, in proportion as they examine, that the Anglican Church, being in very deed a true branch and portion of Christ's church catholic—does not, in all that she imposes as essential to her membership, draw from any broken cisterns hewn out by man's invention, but from the very source and spring of truth, the fountain of living waters; that she goes beyond patristical to apostolical antiquity; that she first embodies, in forms and symbols as comprehensive as concise, the dictates of the mind of God; and then adopts and incorporates, from the traditions or observances of the primitive Church, as transmitted to us by the Fathers, whatever she judges to be useful, impressive, or expedient—limiting the exercise of this authority by two important reservations—first, that 'nothing be repugnant to the word of God:' secondly, that 'all things be done to edifying.' Accordingly, there is, even to the least instructed and intelligent of her members, a prompt and decisive answer to the question:—'Why are you a Churchman?'

‘We trust the Church,’ will be the rejoinder, because we trust the word of God—we follow her, because she is a follower of Christ—her path, so far as we can trace it, is all in light—and if for an instant it seems dubious or intricate, we still follow it with confidence—for we know that it will emerge into a healthy place.’

“It is because I feel deeply (observes Bp. Shuttleworth) how much mischief has already been done in past ages to the cause of Christianity by tampering with the revealed word, and by engrafting human refinements and human speculations upon the clear, definite, and simple law of life : it is from a strong anxiety to see the stream of revelation continue to flow as pure and unadulterated to the last as when it first emanated from the fountain-head, that I would exhort every individual whatever to seek for his religious faith at its very source, carefully excluding the introduction of all extraneous matter whatever, however respectable may appear to be the quarter from which it may be derived. I urge this at once earnestly and confidently, for two reasons. In the first place, I cannot doubt that every really unprejudiced mind, taking the revealed and unsophisticated Scriptures in their plain and obvious acceptance, must, if it admit the *whole* ungarbled truth, necessarily arrive at all the orthodox views maintained by our church ; and, secondly, I own myself at a loss to imagine at what possible point or limit we are to check the discursiveness of our speculations, if we once transgress this definite line, and call in the suggestions of human ingenuity as necessary for the development of the entire counsel of God.”—(p. 101.)

The former of the reasons thus forcibly assigned by the Bishop of Chichester, seems to us to constitute what ought to be, and is, the principle of all genuine orthodox churchmanship ; and the latter, the most or rather the only effectual preservative from almost every species of heresy or dissent. The truth, the whole truth, is comprehended by our church under the distinct, explicit, and unapproachable classification of Divine Revelation—to which nothing can be added, and from which nothing can be subtracted by any Power secondary to that from which they originally came forth. “All Scripture” is alike, “given by inspiration of God,” whether it be communicated in the historical, the didactic, the narrative, the exhortatory, or the prophetic form—whether it be “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness ;” and that which is not contained in the Scripture can have no claim to be received by man, excepting as it is deduced from or conformed to, the word of God. “I am not aware,” observes Bishop Shuttleworth, “of any one flagrant corruption of evangelical truth, from the deep-seated superstition of popery down to the unchristian latitudinarianism of the Socinian, which has not, in fact, been the result of some attempt to improve upon what he finds revealed in the introduction of his own pre-conceived fancies and unauthorized glosses.” Herein therefore consists the distinguishing feature, the characteristic excellence of that portion of Christ’s church which we call the Anglican—she is in the

strictest sense a faithful 'witness and keeper of holy writ;' she does not presume to improve upon what God has revealed, to mutilate it by a system, to expound it by a tradition, to pervert it by a comment, or to mystify it by a gloss;—her liturgy is the concentration of precatory Scripture—her articles are the concentration of doctrinal and declaratory Scripture—her homilies, the standard in substance if not in style—in material if not in method—of all discourses delivered by her ministers, are explicit statements of substantial truths, or simple but energetic applications of Scriptural precepts. Her aim is, to "make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works"—but by the teaching of the word of God alone. The mode of teaching indeed—the accessory, adventitious circumstances of worship—the rites and ceremonies which are conducive if not essential to the decency and order of congregational assemblage;—over these the Anglican Church asserts and exercises power, but still with a protest, a reservation against herself; yet so as she 'ought not to decree anything contrary to Holy Writ'—and the power which she claims not to herself, as an integral portion of the Catholic Church of Christ—neither will she concede to General Councils, which are, if anything can be, the voice of the universal church. She will not admit that whatever is ordained by them can have any strength or authority, 'unless it be declared' (and demonstrated, if demonstration were needed,) 'that it is taken out of Holy Scripture.' The variety of opinions and sentiments and modes of worship among us may be traced, for the most part, to the impatient desire to improve our substantial knowledge, by engrafting our own gratuitous theories upon it; and he who will not find anchorage in the supremacy of Scripture may be driven to and fro by every wind of doctrine, until he make shipwreck of faith and of a good conscience.

"Most wisely, then, did the founders and advocates of our reformed church lay down the fundamental principle of making Scripture, and Scripture only, the rule and standard of our faith. They knew the strong tendency of every thoughtful mind to run astray after its own favourite speculations. They knew, accordingly, that as certainly as a polished plate of metal will become soiled and tarnished by exposure to a moist atmosphere, so surely will the religious opinions of mankind become obscured and adulterated by the mere contact with each other, unless continually renewed and set right by an appeal to the one unchangeable standard of revelation."—(p. 106.)

Now it is manifest, on the most cursory reflection, that to every conscientious and devout attendant on the services of our Church, this appeal to Scripture will be of constant and habitual recurrence. He cannot mingle with the supplications of the great congregation—he cannot uplift the voice of joy or thanksgiving with the few, too

few, who are accustomed to keep holy day—he cannot enter into the hallowed precincts of the House of Prayer, whether to bear his part in the sacred ordinance of baptism, to plight his faith, or witness that of others in the presence of that God, who ‘in the beginning made them male and female,’ or to deposit in the home appointed for all men living, the relics of some kinsman, friend, or associate of past years, without being met by this appeal, whenever the utterance of the Church is heard. The language of the Holy Scripture is, so to speak, her native language; and she employs it as a language intelligible to all her children, of every condition, and of every class—at least in respect of the purposes of salvation. Nothing is needed to the right apprehension of it beyond a pure heart and a willing mind—and these are imparted from above, without respect of persons, which cannot exist with God. “If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, which giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not”—and the equality which is in all things beside a vision, a delusion, a chimera, will be realized in the brotherhood of Christ, so long as the attainment of wisdom and the exercise of prayer are one. The wisdom which the humble Christian seeks will be given; and he will be no less enlightened than his ‘teachers,’ of no less understanding than ‘the ancients,’ because his ‘meditation is upon the testimonies of his God.’

Thus then we elicit a third and a very important feature in the character of the true Churchman. With him, we have seen, the Bible is first the standard and the basis of the Church; next, the Church is the witness and keeper of Holy Writ, diffusing its spirit through her formularies, and embodying its utterance in her prayers—what we have now developed is *the consciousness of an entire and exclusive dependance, in the use of all appointed means, upon the promised influences of the Spirit of God.* ‘It is not in the character of learned men and philosophers, but in that of little children, that we are to seek for admission into the kingdom of heaven;’ and the very same process which giveth ‘light to them that are in darkness,’ and ‘understanding to the simple, is that which makes manifest the weakness of human strength;—the shallowness of human philosophy, the emptiness of human acquirements, and the foolishness of human wisdom. That process is “the entrance of God’s word”—and the entrance of God’s word is only through the instrumentality of God’s Spirit. From the associated body of worshippers, though combining the extremes of an intellect little lower than the angels, and a perception scarcely superior to the brutes, ascends the same appeal to One who seeth “that we have no power of ourselves to help ourselves,”

and of whom we intreat that "His Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts." All rest upon the level of the same lowliness—the same necessity—the same corruption; all are cast upon the same divine provision alike for the cancelling of past offences, and the prevention or correction of future frailties and errors. He who feels this at all is, we may believe, a true and acceptable worshipper; he who feels it in association with the services of our Church is, we may safely pronounce, the genuine and consistent Churchman. And though from these central and fundamental doctrines of our faith may issue and expand an almost infinite series of truths to be developed, doctrines to be explained, mysteries to be adored, affording scope and range for the most exalted and expansive powers which can exist in the earth-born heir of immortality;—yet there must be in the feeblest a tenacious grasp of, and in the most intellectual a constant recognition of, and recurrence to, **FIRST PRINCIPLES**. These principles, based upon facts, are few in number, and easy of apprehension—but of measureless expansion, of most grave and momentous import. These the Church guards, as a peculiar trust and deposit, from all mixture and adulteration whatever. She fixes our attention, severally and prominently, on the incarnation, the ministry, and the sufferings of our divine Redeemer for the expiation of the sins of a lost world; sanctification through the aid of the Holy Spirit; holiness of life, its legitimate and natural consequence; and a final judgment to come, whether unto eternal life, or eternal condemnation; and doing this, she knows no distinction of high or low, rich or poor, learned or unlearned: each who has been admitted by baptism into her sacred pale is in her view, a sworn soldier and servant of Christ unto his life's end—to each she extends the sign of the cross, with the silent yet eloquent pledge, **IN HOC SIGNO VINCES**; to each she applies with impartial and maternal encouragement the promise of the Saviour, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

To those then who are, or who desire to be, Churchmen such as we have described; accepting the Holy Scriptures as the supreme and unappealable standard both of practice and belief; recognizing what Bishop Shuttleworth (with a noble disregard to the affectation of a fictitious obsolescence, so fashionable in the present age, but exhibiting only the rust of antiquity without its mellowness) terms "The **GREAT PROTESTANT PRINCIPLE** of the entire sufficiency of the Scriptures as a summary of divine truth to them that believe;" to all such, this little volume will be a most seasonable and acceptable present. Avoiding the perilous ground of controversy, in which it is much easier to compromise charity than to communi-

cate instruction, he has most effectually combated error, by exhibiting the native beauty and simplicity of truth. The two first Discourses in the volume (though it has harmonized with our present purpose to make our selections exclusively from the last) are equally worthy of perusal, and will equally repay it. The subjects of 'Justification by Faith,' and the 'Merciful Character of the Gospel Covenant,' are alike handled with a power and a plainness, the union of which is as rare as it is felicitous. 'With excellency of speech and wisdom' few were better qualified to appear before the academical body, the most illustrious of auditories, than the profound and philosophical Warden of New College; but he has studied in a school, which has taught him, as its first lesson, the entire concentration of the force of the intellect upon Scripture and Scripture only, unimpeded by the disturbing power of 'far-fetched philosophical speculations;'—and thus determined, like the Apostle, to "know nothing but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified," he comes, not with the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth—counting it better, with that primitive Bishop and Pastor of the Flock, who ought to be (would to God he were) the model and pattern of all succeeding times, to speak but five words with his understanding, that by his voice he might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.' How different this is from the language of mystical reserve which aims once more to interpose the veil between man and God which Christ hath rent in twain, we deem it needless to observe. If the end of preaching is to save souls—if the means by which this end is, under God, most effectually prosecuted, are the enlightenment of the understanding, the conviction of the judgment, the awakening of the conscience, and the impression of the heart—then while we may congratulate the Church on the late addition of such a member to the hierarchy, we may congratulate ourselves even on the unseemly postponement of Dr. Shuttleworth's elevation to the 'Episcopate,' by the opportunity which it has afforded for the exhibition of his faithfulness as a Divine, in which he is a model for the imitation of all. If, as the Nurse and Mother of Theologians, the University of Oxford may be said to be

δρεπες' κορυφας ηρεταν απο πασαν,

it would be no easy task to find three fairer flowers in her wreath, than those which have been here laid upon her shrine by one of the most distinguished of her sons.

We must not however pass over in silence the motive which has

been assigned by the Bishop, in his candid and judicious preface, for the publication of these Discourses at the present crisis :—

“ Had they been written by me ten or fifteen years ago, I should not have conceived it worth while to lay them in their present form before the public. However suitable to a Christian congregation, the sentiments which they express were too universally assented to at that period as obviously and universally true, to require their being formally pressed upon the public attention through the medium of the press. But circumstances in this respect are strangely altered. The restlessness of public feeling, which has for some time past been exercising its influence over other branches of study, has now extended itself to our theology. The doctrines of “justification through faith,” of “the free pardon of sin through the gospel covenant,” and of “the entire sufficiency of Scripture as our guide to salvation,” are no longer, as formerly, accepted by all parties within our church as almost trite and undeniable truths. Within the last few years a strong and extensively organized effort has been made, if not openly to controvert them, at least to weaken their evidence, and practically to supersede them. Minute and unessential points of practice have been rigidly insisted on; inferences, either derived from Scripture by a strained exaggeration of particular texts, or purely and simply the product of human caprice, have been oracularly brought forward as indispensable parts of faith; and thus, whilst men’s attention has been drawn away from fundamental principles, a system of theology has been set up, not of that soul-stirring and yet simple character taught by the apostles, but blended with many of the superadditions, not to say cold superstitions, of a later and far less pure period. That a form of Christianity thus at once arbitrary and servile (not now adopted for the first time, but merely the revival of obsolete and almost forgotten opinions) is not likely to retain any lasting hold of the public mind, I most readily believe.

“ Confident, however, as I am, that the system now attempted to be set up in this country is not likely to be of long duration, still it is not without feelings of anxiety that I have remarked the momentary prevalence which it has obtained during the last few years, more especially among the younger members of our clergy. Under such circumstances it would seem to be incumbent upon every sincere friend to the principles of the Protestant Reformation and (as I conceive them to be) of evangelical truth, openly to declare their dissent from doctrines which, if they are doing nothing more, are at least disarming those principles of their poignancy and efficacy. In order to do this, however, it does not appear to me to be either necessary or desirable that they should entangle themselves or their readers in the irritation of controversy. A candid, calm, and dispassionate statement of their own opinions, precisely as they have derived them from the fountain-head of Holy Writ, with as little reference as possible to the rival sentiments of others, will be all that will be required of them.

“ Such, I trust, have been my own feelings in preparing the following discourses for publication. As compositions they are probably worth little: they have, however, been written with a solemn, conscientious belief in the soundness of the principles they advocate. Being such, my hope is that they may be in some degree useful in calling out an increased attention to the fundamental and palmary truths of the gospel. Should they fail of that effect, still my object, though in a much lower degree, will be in some respects answered: they will serve, at all events, to record my formal dissent from that opposite system of doctrines which have of late been set forth under so many advantages of confederated members, extensive erudition, and (why should I not add?) of unblemished excellence in the details of Christian practice.”—(pp. v.—x.)

We have indulged in this long extract, first for the satisfaction

of our readers, and secondly for our own. It will be a satisfaction to our readers to find that the chasm which was made in the Episcopal Bench by the removal of one of the most amiable and conciliatory of Prelates; one whose life was a charm of charity which went far to annihilate the interval now unhappily and unwisely interposed between the different orders of the Christian ministry, and to realize that 'fellow-eldership' which has scarcely existed in the church since the days of her apostolical purity—it will, we are sure, be a satisfaction to our readers that such a chasm should have been filled up by a Prelate of equal candour, and of not inferior benevolence;—one, who can correct in the spirit of meekness, and remonstrate in the spirit of love—one, who will strenuously and resolutely maintain first principles, and contend earnestly, yet charitably, for the faith once delivered to the saints. And it is a satisfaction to ourselves; for in meditating on this work we had already arrived at the conclusion, which the Bishop has so ably affirmed, that there could only be one way of contending effectually with any system of 'trifling and fanciful theology'—the calm, candid, and dispassionate statement of the opposite opinions, as derived fresh and pure from the fountain head of Holy Writ—the statement of a plain, perspicuous, palpable alternative—on the one side, 'Thus saith the master, the teacher, the scholar, the theologian, the divine;' on the other, 'Thus saith the Lord.' Whatever be the 'rival sentiments' or arguments of others, if we can only take their conclusion, and place it in direct, pointed, and obvious antagonism with some principle clearly developed in the word of God, the process of investigating fallacies and exposing delusions one by one is clearly superseded. Two contradictories cannot be true; and the words which man's wisdom teacheth being thus tried and found wanting, by those which the Holy Ghost teacheth; the answer will be as definitive as it is explicit—'Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.'

We are indeed well aware that the chief difficulty in combating error will consist in the detection of this latent antagonism. It may be so speciously arrayed, so ingeniously disguised, so dexterously enveloped in the mantle of truth, even as to the arrangement of the drapery and the disposition of the folds, that we shall not perhaps, in the first instance, so much as suspect its real nature; and we may shrink from incurring the peril of sacrilege by striking at what is true, when we only aim at self-defence by repelling what is false. But the talisman of safety will be found in the application of the scripture AS A WHOLE. There is scarcely any variety of error which may not be glossed and palliated by laying undue and dispropor-

tionate stress on particular texts, detached from the context, and unaccompanied by what we may term the compensating and counterpoising passages, which shall illustrate their real tendency and design. Hence we may justify the strong expression of Bishop Shuttleworth—though little more in substance than the saying of the great Reformer and the deduction of Scripture itself—‘that the experienced bible Christian, whoever he may be, who has drunk most deeply at the fountain-head of holy writ, is, after all, the best theologian.’ And surely, on the same principle we may affirm, that he who has been most diligent in the study and most devout in the employment of the accredited services and formularies of our church—who has confirmed his own belief of our liturgy, articles, and homilies, by comparing them with the word of God on which alone they profess to be based—irrespective of all glosses, comments, expositions, and interpretations of ritualists, symbolists, and speculative or ceremonial Divines—is the best Churchman. Theology, as to its essentials, must be the universal science, or there would be respect of persons with God. Churchmanship, as to its essentials, must be universal also—or the church would not be what she professes, the channel through which the covenanted mercies of God flow freely forth to man. ‘The entire concentration of the powers of the intellect on Scripture, and Scripture only, unimpeded by the disturbing power of far-fetched philosophical speculations, may not unnaturally be conceived to suggest to the humble classes of society, a distinctness and readiness of apprehension in divine things, and a correctness of religious feeling, which the scholar, amid his ponderous tomes of controversial learning, may sigh after in vain.’ And believing most implicitly that such is in truth the action of the equalizing power of the grace of God, it will be our endeavour to exhibit the beauty and symmetry of the Christian system, by placing the eye of the beholder in the centre—and thus, though he may not see far around him, yet the circle will be all of light. Whatever contradicts, or mutilates or invalidates, or disparages Scripture, this, he will determine at once, is of man—whatever perplexes, or circumscribes, or obscures it, this, he will more than surmise, is not of God.

We have thus, it may be hoped, intimated with sufficient clearness and decision, the part which we propose to take—if part it may be called—in the controversy which now divides the Anglican church, and threatens to strike, if it has not already stricken, at the foundations of our venerable Establishment. Assuredly, “when a house is divided against itself, that house cannot stand”—and we fear it would be no difficult task to point out sections of the Church, wherein out of five, three are divided against two, and two against three—the one part charging the other with ultra-protestantism,

and these again retaliating and recriminating with insinuations—and perhaps more than insinuations—of nascent papistry, and progressive convergency towards Rome. We will make it our constant aim, therefore, if not to mediate between conflicting parties, at least to call away their views from the points on which they differ to those on which they agree—and in order to avoid all reasonable suspicion, all just imputation of prejudice or partisanship, we will apply to either side one and the same unerring standard. “To the law and to the testimony—if they speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in them.” On either side, the power of native talent, and the resources of profound and varied scholarship, are alike pressed into the controversy—but on one side only does there seem to be that principle which of itself constitutes strength where all beside is weakness—the principle of union—of confederation. The opening numbers of this Review will sufficiently evince at once how diversified and how ingenious—how adapted to all classes, conditions, and circumstances of readers—are the channels through which ‘the opposite system of doctrines’ to those so ably and luminously set forth in the sermons of Dr. Shuttleworth is infused into the popular mind. We have our ‘philosophical persons,’ if not to make ‘modern and familiar things supernatural and causeless’—yet to insinuate symbolic superstitions under the pretext of teaching Christian Ethics;—we have Poets, who enlist all ‘the charm and force of heaven-bred poesy’ under the banner of what it is now the fashion to term “antiquity,” and who muffle within the veil of a melodious mysticism, which by nine readers out of ten, will be the more relished in proportion as it is less understood—the corruptions and perversions of the Church when it first bartered its apostolical purity for political power and influence;—and as if it were not enough that ‘Water Lilies from the Cherwell,’ of which the very odour is an opiate, should be presented to the best lovers of poetry—the youth of either sex (*Virginibus puerisque canto*); we have springes set for the despisers or disparagers of poetry in ‘Tales of the Village,’ which are, only in a form somewhat modified, a new, if not an improved, series of ‘Tracts for the Times.’ If however there be a test of truth—it will be one of universal application. When the dearest and most enduring interests of all are concerned, He, who is no respecter of persons, will not leave any without the power of discerning between the evil and the good. And that power consists in the right use and application of the word of God. Small risk can there be of falling into error, when the standard which we employ is all and only truth—and, so long as we thus “prove all things,” who can doubt the issue to be, that we shall “hold fast that which is good!”

A WINTER IN THE WEST INDIES, *described in familiar letters to Henry Clay of Kentucky.* By JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY. London: Murray. 1840.

THE British West Indies have been recently the scene of one of the most important moral revolutions recorded in the history of the human race. A population of nearly eight hundred thousand persons, descended from a long ancestry of slaves, and born to the possession of hereditary servitude, has been called by an act of the supreme government into the unrestricted enjoyment of freedom. It was an interesting problem, as regarded the immediate welfare of the West India Islands themselves, whether this change would, as had been confidently predicted by its opponents, be productive of effects the most disastrous and fatal—whether it would at once paralyze the entire social system, and, by destroying the only incentives to labour, involve the consequent loss of a great amount of capital employed in the staple manufactures of the country; or whether, as was hoped and believed by the friends of emancipation, motives of self-interest might be safely depended on, to arouse the exertion of the free man, and to furnish a supply of industry proportioned to the demand; and the result was expected by either party with intense anxiety and many misgivings.

It was recollected, that the subjects of this change were in a measure incapacitated for the use of liberty by the habits acquired during their previous condition of servitude; and it was feared even by the most sanguine, that their moral vision, weakened and impaired by a long acquaintance with darkness, would require a protracted training, before it could be rendered capable of enduring the blaze of light thus suddenly poured in upon it. One only hope of better things seemed to suggest itself in the fact, that the knowledge of Christianity had been widely disseminated among the Negroes, and that Christian principles were capable of an application to every emergency.

But there were other and more important interests at stake than the immediate welfare of the West India Islands. The attention of the Old and of the New World was fixed upon this experiment. Its success could not fail of furnishing the friends of Africa with another and a most powerful, because a practical, argument for the universal abolition of slavery. Its failure would rivet the fetters of the slave, and if it did not condemn him to interminable bondage, would, at least, crush his hopes for the present, and put off the consideration of his claims to some far distant day.

We ourselves felt intensely upon this subject. We had supported the cause of emancipation upon lofty grounds. 'Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum,' was the motto inscribed upon our banner when we joined this holy crusade. We believed that the word of God disallowed the right of man to hold his fellow in servitude ;—that the relation of master and slave was utterly incompatible with obedience to that commandment by which we are required to regulate our intercourse with each other: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" and, believing this, we could not pause to calculate consequences, nor suffer any considerations of expediency to interfere with the performance of a positive duty. But we were fully aware that though Protestant England might be aroused to the performance of a tardy act of justice by an appeal to Christian principles, the objections of self-interest must be silenced, before the cause of emancipation could be expected to make much progress on the continent of Europe, or in the slave-states of America: and proportioned to the strength of our conviction is the joy with which we hail the actual fulfilment of our most sanguine hopes.

The little volume of Mr. Gurney, entitled, 'A Winter in the West Indies,' professes to give an account of the working of emancipation in the British Colonies. It is addressed, in a series of familiar letters, to Henry Clay of Kentucky, a well-known and influential member of the American Congress, but unfortunately one of those whose views on the subject of slavery stand out in strange contrast with the liberality of his sentiments on every other point. Mr. Gurney visited the West Indies in the capacity of a minister of religion, his mission from the Society of Friends in this country to the members of their body resident in the New World, being altogether of a religious character. He found time, however, during an abode of four months in Tortola, St. Christopher's, Antigua, Dominica, and Jamaica, to obtain much information from others, and to draw many conclusions for himself; and feelingly alive to the important question of American slavery, he hastened, on his return to the United States, to publish the result of his enquiries and observations, in the hope that a work addressed to a gentleman, generally regarded as a leader of the pro-slavery party, would attract some amount of public attention, and lead to the removal of many prejudices. Mr. Gurney has republished his volume in England, justly deeming that 'the practical details of the working of emancipation in our West India colonies, must be as interesting to the friends of humanity in our own country, as to those in America,' and with the further object of upholding 'the maintenance of the present prohibitory duties on slave-grown coffee and sugar.'

We feel convinced that the expectations of Mr. Gurney, as to the

interest felt in England with regard to the actual working of emancipation, will not be disappointed; and that his calm and dispassionate view of the subject will be hailed by the majority of our readers with satisfaction and gratitude. The manner in which he has executed his task is beyond all praise. Setting aside his propensity to versification, we have not a fault to find with his book. Had he submitted his manuscript to our revision, we hesitate not to say, that we should have mercilessly run our pen through every one of his poetical effusions: but here our 'limæ labor' would have terminated. His views are those of the sincere Christian and the enlightened philanthropist, and not content with detailing the results of his own observation, he has further furnished us with practical details—the statistics, as we may call them, of freedom and slavery, which are invaluable, because the deductions to which they lead are conclusive, as regards the working of the two systems.

The amount of imports into a country always bears a ratio to the comforts of its inhabitants. Mr. Gurney shews us that the amount of imports into Antigua, where freedom has been longest tried, has increased seventy per cent in the short period of six years, and that in all the West India Islands it is rapidly increasing.

In a prosperous state of society the population has a tendency to multiply. Mr. Gurney further shews that the causes which obstructed the operation of this natural law have been removed, and that the average of births maintains a wholesome excess over that of deaths, whereas under the baneful operation of slavery the contrary result was universal. The diminution of crime; the state of the gaols, all comparatively empty; the increase of churches, of chapels, and of schools, and above all the general prevalence of marriage, are evidences of an extensive moral improvement. On all these points Mr. Gurney furnishes abundant information. The one fact that in a single church the average attendance has increased "from three hundred to sixteen hundred at least, the communicants from twenty-seven to two hundred and eighty-nine; that in 1835 the bishop confirmed forty-seven persons, in 1840 he confirmed in the same place six hundred and thirty-five, and that in the last six years of slavery the number of marriages at this church was four hundred and twenty-one, in five years and a half of partial or entire freedom, two thousand and fourteen," is worth a thousand assertions unsupported by such conclusive evidence.

The only dark feature in the picture—the only drawback upon this progressive amount of morality and happiness, is the admitted falling off in the staple exports of Jamaica, *coffee* and *sugar*. But here too Mr. Gurney comes to our aid: he informs us that in Antigua, where emancipation is of earlier date, and where its

effects have been more fully realized, the advantages derivable from free labour have been demonstrated in the production of a larger quantity of *sugar*, under the stimulus of moderate wages, than was obtained under the previous system of compulsion; the amount exported in the sixth year of freedom, after the fair trial of five years, nearly doubling the average of the last five years of slavery; and he ascribes, as we think with good reason, the contrary result in Jamaica "mainly to causes which class under slavery, and not under freedom." "In the mean time," he says, "the imports of the island are rapidly increasing; trade improving; the towns thriving; new villages rising in every direction; property much enhanced in value; well-managed estates productive and profitable; expenses of management diminished; short methods of labour adopted; provisions cultivated on a larger scale than ever; and the people, wherever they are properly treated, industrious, contented, and gradually accumulating wealth. Above all, education is rapidly spreading; the morals of the community improving; crime in many districts disappearing; and Christianity exerting her sway with vastly augmented force over the mass of the population. "Cease from all attempts," he adds, "to oppose the current of justice and mercy—remove every obstruction to the fair and full working of freedom—and the bud of Jamaica's prosperity, already fragrant and vigorous, will soon burst into a glorious flower."

We hail the opening of this delightful prospect, and most unwilling should we be to see a shade cast over the sunshine which is beginning to play along the distant horizon: but while we concur with Mr. Gurney in deprecating any relaxation of the prohibitory duties upon sugar produced by slave labour; while we hesitate not to say, that we should consider such a proceeding big with misery to unborn millions, and disastrous to the cause of humanity, alike as regards the extinction of the African slave-trade, and the final abolition of slavery; we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that this country has paid to the West India proprietors twenty millions of money, by way of compensation for their supposed loss in the service of their liberated slaves, and that this large sum must be considered to have been granted mainly under the idea, that their labour as free men would not be equally available in the cultivation of sugar. It is clearly unjust therefore that the British public should be required to compensate the West Indian a second time, by purchasing sugar at a dear market; especially since this article has now become, if not one of the absolute necessities of life, at least an essential requisite as regards the comforts of the middle and lower, as well as of the higher classes. Let free labour in the

East Indies be allowed to compete on equal terms with free labour in the West. Jamaica and Hindostan are both British colonies. In both it should be our object to call forth the industry of the native, while we attempt to ameliorate his condition and to improve his character; but in Hindostan the native population is incalculably the greater. The equalization of duties upon East Indian and West Indian produce seems to be demanded on a principle of common fairness: we believe it is a boon which would content the British public, and would prove to them, that, if they are still required to pay a somewhat higher price for the sugar which they consume, than that at which it might be obtained under supposable circumstances, the additional tax is imposed for an object which ought to be dear to every free man, namely, the exclusion of slave labour from our markets—the extinction of the African slave trade, and the universal abolition of slavery itself.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF SOCIETY *in the Barbarous and Civilized State: an Essay towards discovering the Origin and Course of Human Improvement.* By Dr. W. C. TAYLOR. LL.D. M.R.A.S., of Trinity College, Dublin. In two vols. Longman. 1840.

NEXT to the progress of Christianity itself, the history of civilization, and of the great changes in the course of human society, has peculiar claims on the attention of the thoughtful Christian. The two subjects are indeed very closely related to each other. Civilization is the handmaid to divine truth, and the redemption of nature to the service of man advances by parallel steps with the redemption of man himself to the service of his Maker. The history of society is the stately porch—the history of the church of God the magnificent temple to which it leads.

The present work of Dr. Taylor is devoted to the former of these subjects. Its design is to trace the course of civilization from early times, to unfold the elements which compose it, and the conservative principles of which society, in its more advanced stages, stands in need. The first volume treats of the physical constitution of man, the nature of barbarism and civilization, of property, war, and indigence;—the superstitions, usages, and arts of savage life; the marks of lost civilization in the New World; the scriptural accounts of its origin, and its patriarchal stage. The second proceeds with a brief review of Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian,

Phœnician, Greek and Roman civilization ;—then traces the decline of Polytheism, and the effects of Christianity and the Barbarian irruptions, with the character of the Middle Ages ; and closes with remarks on the conservative principles of public and private benevolence.

From this sketch it will be plain that the Author travels through a wide range of subjects. The outline, however, is very imperfectly filled up. The reader is entertained by a variety of curious facts or anecdotes, with ingenious reflections interspersed ; but he is seldom awakened by large and ennobling views of God's providence, or enlightened by profound and original thought. A more serious fault is the vague and dreamy tone of theology which runs through the work, whenever it touches upon the grand topics of revealed truth. We regret exceedingly, as Christians and as churchmen, that the benevolence of the author's design is not seconded by a more vigorous tone of reflection, and a more solid and deep acquaintance with Scripture doctrine. From his preface he appears to be a disciple of Dr. Whateley, to whom he dedicates his work in terms of excessive praise ; and the Essay bears, as is natural, many traces of that well-known school of thought. Its candour verges on indifference, its charity is tainted by great laxity of doctrine, its philosophical views border on neological subtlety ; and its hopes for the progress of society rest more on a Pelagian oversight of man's corruption, than on the sure word of prophecy, and the unfailing covenant of God. In so wide a field as the work embraces, we can only glance at a few points, among many that would repay an attentive and close inquiry. Our aim must be to exhibit some of those Christian principles which are vital to the subject, and which our author presents very dimly, or entirely passes by.

The first requisite for a Christian writer, who attempts to unfold the course of human society, and investigate the laws of civilization, is a clear perception of the great end of society itself, and of God's providence in this lower world. If this be wanting, all his speculations will be vague, confused, and without a distinct aim. That end, as revealed in the word of God, is the redemption of innumerable souls to holiness, happiness, and eternal joy, and the unveiling of the Divine perfections in their pure and blessed harmony of righteousness, wisdom, power, and love. But to realize the constancy and truth of this high purpose of God, amidst the troublous scenes of the world's history, and the dark chaos of human passion and crime, requires a deep-rooted sense of the fall and apostacy of mankind. Unless we feel, with a living conviction, that ' man is very far gone from original righteousness, we shall never catch

even a glimpse of the deep wisdom of Providence and the fulness of its grace, in the steps employed for his restoration from age to age. Proud, self-righteous views of human nature are as fatal to sound philosophy and true historical insight, as to Christian orthodoxy and practical holiness.

Viewed in this first aspect, the work before us is grievously defective. We may take, as a specimen, almost the last paragraph of the whole. "Every one," the author observes, "may be astonished to find how vast are the unworked mines of goodness which exist in human nature. It may almost be said that we only hate those whom we do not know. Could hostile parties see the secrets of each other's minds, their mutual rage would soon be exchanged for mutual respect and mutual estimation. Misanthropists have averred that the window in the breast would set the world by the ears; but every day's experience proves that the more men know of each other, the more they are disposed to live in peace, unity, and concord."

How utterly opposite are such sentiments to the true and faithful sayings of God. He in whom perfect knowledge is combined with deepest tenderness, gives a very different account of the human heart. "There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God." "From within, out of the heart of man, proceed evil thoughts." "There is none good but one, even God." "The heart is deceitful above all things." These, and such as these, are the descriptions of man's heart supplied by the inspired writers, and by the Son of God himself. The passage, in which God's 'philanthropy' is most expressly declared, Tit. ii. 4. is one in which the corruption of man is portrayed in the most vivid and painful colours. We read nothing there of 'the vast unworked mines of goodness in human nature.' Such flattering words have no place in the oracles of God; and ill, very ill, do they agree with the confessions of the holiest Christians, in their highest acts of devotion, that "the remembrance of their sins is grievous, and the burden of them intolerable." How far truer is the sentiment of our fairy poet,

"If any strength we have, it is for ill;
But all the good is God's, both power and eke the will."

This radical and grievous error spreads, like a blight, through the pages of the present work. Hence the absence of all deep and spirit-stirring thought, on one of the noblest themes which can occupy the thoughts of a Christian. Dim, partial views of the fall, lead, by necessary consequence, to low and unworthy concep-

tions of the great scheme of redemption, and cast a dark cloud over the glorious landscape of Divine Providence. The 'great mystery of godliness' then sinks into a curious speculation, a mere concurrent in the causes of social progress, instead of forming the centre and key-stone of the world's history, and awaking into full exercise every power of the understanding and the noblest emotions of a grateful heart.

The second great idea which should preside in every sketch of social progress, is a just conception, in their main outlines, of God's various dispensations. The distinct features must be clearly apprehended, which mark the patriarchal age, the Mosaic economy, and the times of the Gentiles; and that future kingdom of Christ which is now, in part, veiled in mystery, but whose reality and eternal grandeur is so brightly portrayed in the sacred oracles. Progress, we know well, is a favourite watchword in the mouths of revolutionists and infidels of every grade; but few of them have ever caught a glimpse of that vast and majestic bourne, towards which the course of time is fast hurrying us along. We are fully aware that great caution, and a sound mind, are eminently needful in those who enter upon ground so sacred and mysterious; but this we may assert boldly, that whoever would exhibit to the church a just and solid view of the past history of mankind, must first, by scriptural research and patient meditation, have fixed in his mind the outlines of that dispensation of glory which is to come. Deprived of this light, which the word of prophecy alone can supply, history becomes an ocean without a chart, a voyage without a harbour, a wild chaos without any voice from heaven to speak its jarring elements into order and beauty.

This second principle is equally wanting in Dr. Taylor's work. It would be hard to gather from it even the author's own expectations, much less can we descry those cheering hopes which are everywhere presented to us in the word of God. In the pages of infidel philosophers, or worldly politicians, it would of course be Utopian to expect a reference to such hopes, unless for scorn and derision. But our author treads upon higher ground, and breathes a purer atmosphere; his pages abound in quotations from Scripture, and in appeals to its authority; and we may therefore with reason claim from him, on such a subject, a full and clear recognition of the glorious hopes, and final destinies of the church of God. The almost total want of such a reference in these volumes leaves them without a distinct scope, or perceptible unity of design. We lose our way in a wilderness of curious anecdotes, instead of tracing the main stream of providence, till it opens into a wide ocean of everlasting peace.

The work begins with an enquiry into the nature of civilization. We shall extract from this a few paragraphs.

"When we attempt to take a comprehensive survey of the actual condition of humanity, our attention is not less forcibly arrested by the moral than by the physical differences which offer themselves to our view. One race is in a state of continuous and progressive improvement: it has exchanged rude paths for smooth roads—it is again changing these for railroads; every day of its existence produces some new discovery tending to increase the comforts and conveniences of life; intellectual advancement seems to keep pace with material improvements; in fact, a progressive advance is manifest, to which imagination can scarcely assign limits.

"A second race appears to have set bounds to itself; the evidences of former progress are abundant, but no traces of a tendency to further and future improvement can be discovered. Every thing in the physical and moral condition of society seems to have assumed a stereotype character—from the model of the meanest domestic utensil to the highest social institution, there is a permanent uniformity. Such, for instance, is the great empire of China, where thought and action are equally forced to accommodate themselves to an unchanging system devised in remote ages.

"Passing over many intervening varieties, we arrive at a race which appears little raised above the brute creation; it has few evidences of having ever made progress, and none either of the power or will to advance itself beyond its present condition. There is neither memory of the past, nor foresight of the future: such is the stationary aspect of barbarism, as it is presented to our notice by the aboriginal inhabitants of Australia."—(vol. i. pp. 1—3.)

"Comparing all these different conditions, we find that they have one common defect—stagnancy: they tend to keep every thing in one fixed position, to check advance and improvement; and hence we may fairly conclude that the primary element of civilization, according to the common sense of mankind, is progress, not from one place to another, but from one condition to another, and always in advance. The idea of progress, development, amelioration, or extension, appears to be the predominant notion (logically speaking, the *genus*) in the definition of civilization; and the most prominent attribute is, that the progress should be made in social life.

"It may be objected that this definition would cease to be applicable if perfect civilization were allowed; but we can see no bounds or limits to the advancement of knowledge:

The wide, the unbounded prospect lies before us;
But shadows, clouds, and darkness rest upon it.

Every advance that has yet been made, shews an equally distant horizon placed beyond us. It is not necessary to discuss the question of the perfectibility of the human species, but should humanity attain perfection, we doubt if civilization would be the proper term to describe its condition. Who has ever dreamed of speaking of the civilization of the kingdom of heaven!

"Civilization is progressive, and barbarism stationary; hence many have been led to infer, that the latter is the state of nature, or natural condition of man,—an inference which perhaps may be traced to the vulgar notions of motion and rest; for even philosophers find it difficult to divest themselves of the habit of regarding the *vis inertiae* of matter as more naturally displayed in rest than in motion.

"Before investigating the question whether civilization or barbarism be the more natural, we should inquire, What is the true state of nature of any person or thing? A simple instance will suffice to shew that this is not so easy a matter as is generally imagined. Pine trees are found on the high Alps near the confines of perpetual snow; but they are stunted in their

growth, they scarce put forth any branches, and their leaves are not fully developed. Pine trees are also found in too luxuriant soils, which give them a precocious exuberance, leading to a deranged organism and early decay. In either case, can the trees be said to be in their natural state? Assuredly not; we know that there are fundamental laws of the life and being of the tree, and that the state most natural to it is that in which it fulfils most completely the end and object for which it is made, according to its organization and the principles of its vitality. Man, in a state of nature, must therefore be man in the state for which nature has fitted him. Is there a definite mould and form to which his faculties are irrevocably predestined and predetermined? then nature has designed him to remain stationary, and the natural man is the savage. On the other hand, are his faculties expansive, his capacities progressive, and his moral endowments susceptible of cultivation? If so, nature has organized him for progress; civilization is the natural state, and barbarism the artificial."—(vol. i. pp. 4—6.)

These opening remarks appear to labour under the defect which has been already noticed. If the author at the outset had recognized the Fall of Man, in its scriptural breadth and fulness, he would scarcely have sought to determine his natural state by the uncertain analogy of the pine-tree, when a simple and full answer was in his reach. If by 'the natural state,' he meant that for which man was designed by creation, or to which it is the purpose of divine grace to restore him, neither barbarism, nor civilization, in its usual sense, can claim that title. If again, by a state of nature, we mean that to which man ever tends, when left to his own unaided powers, barbarism has clearly much the fairest claim. But if, by this ambiguous phrase, we intend that state which is most favourable to the developement of man's natural powers, and to the furtherance of the great work of his spiritual recovery, then civilized society is the natural state, and barbarism, in this sense, as unnatural as it is degrading. The question resolves itself into one simply of the use of words; and perhaps of all terms, nature is the most ambiguous. Again, we doubt the correctness of the definition that 'civilization is progressive, barbarism stationary.' New Zealand, there can be no doubt, is now in a state of progress; yet it can scarcely be called civilized: and Italy and Spain have perhaps been retrograding for centuries; but few would style them, even yet, barbarous countries.

The following seems a more correct view of the real contrast between barbarous and civilized society. Only the light of revealed truth—whether primitive and patriarchal, oral, or written,—can rescue man, when once fallen, from a state of savage violence, with its natural effects of brutish ignorance and barbarian debasement. Wherever this light shines, beside its nobler and heavenlier fruits, it inspires a vast and mighty energy into the human mind, which spreads with electric power through every outward sphere of thought and action. This energy, however, lasts much longer

than the cause which gave it birth. So long as its action continues, society maintains a continual progress, and wealth, grandeur, and luxury follow upon the steps of advancing art and enlarging science. But however great the acquired momentum, when the first moving force is withdrawn, it must gradually decline. Civilization has then reached its height. Step by step, society ebbs back again to its first level. Luxury deadens the exertions of genius, wealth poisons the fountains of public morals, passion and party strife rend the vitals of the state, till at length the fearful change is complete, and the once flourishing and noble commonwealth becomes, like the spectre of the Trojan hero, a fearful memorial of perished greatness, a ghastly apparition, covered with filth and defiled with gore.

Now if this be a just view of the causes and nature of barbarism and civilization, they cannot be defined simply by progress and retrogression. The Roman Empire surely would not be called barbarous from the first moment of its decline, nor till centuries later. The distinction is perhaps one of degree, rather than of kind. A state is civilized in proportion as law and right predominate over individual passion and self-will. It is barbarous, just as life and property come to depend on the brute violence of despotic chieftains or a tyrant populace. The causes which, when unchecked, have power to depress the most flourishing state down to the level of barbarism, are rooted in man's moral nature, and are ever ready to start into full activity. Even in our own favoured land, let the ordinances of the church be once uprooted, and the gospel of Christ, with all its mighty influences of grace, disowned and cast away, and the elements of evil may be seen already at work, that would quickly hurry us down to the lowest depth of savage debasement. The warning applies to nations, no less than to persons; "Thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but fear."

In fact the only true and lasting civilization consists in the incorporation and transfusion of divine truth into all the arts, habits, laws, and customs of the social polity. Whatever is short of this is deceptive and fallacious. It may have a season of outward vigour and seeming progress: it may look very fair to a superficial view; but the elements of health and life are wanting. Its activity will be only a feverish excitement, sure to be succeeded by the languor of decay; its grace and refinement are only the hectic flush which betrays the secret consumption that is preying on its vitals. Revealed truth, inwrought into the texture of the social constitution, can alone preserve a state from lapsing deeper and deeper into hopeless barbarism. It is true that imperfect

elements of this truth, due to earlier stages of revelation, and mingled with much corruption, may preserve from total debasement, but nothing else can arrest the downward progress. Before the severance of the State from the Church, that favourite nostrum of some short-sighted religionists, could be fully complete, the State itself would be at an end, and its population transformed into a savage and untameable horde of barbarians.

But we must pass on to a kindred subject. The sixth chapter, on War, contains many interesting facts, designed to shew its peculiar atrocities in a savage state. The author then adds the following remarks :—

“ War, as we have seen, is more frequent among savage than civilized nations ; it is also more sanguinary and more ferocious, and it is utterly destitute of those redeeming features which throw its horrors into the shade. There is no heroism, no spirit of chivalry, no high and noble daring ; there is nothing but cruelty in the victor, and misery for the vanquished.

“ War is not to be regarded as always an unmixed evil : it is the consequence of the essential diversity of the elements of humanity ; its root is inherent in the very nature of the ideas in which the existence of different nations is founded ; for these ideas being necessarily partial, bounded, and exclusive, are necessarily hostile, aggressive, and tyrannical. In the first quarrel on record—that between Cain and Abel—there was a diversity of occupation, and consequently a diverse development of the elements of human nature. “ Abel was a keeper of sheep, and Cain a tiller of the ground.” Hostility between these occupations, on a larger scale, meets us in the earliest pages of history.”—(vol. i. pp. 127, 128.)

The first sentiment here advanced is one of whose truth there can be little doubt : but those which follow are open to very just censure. It is too common with German neologists to palm an interpretation on Scripture which it will not bear, to suit some theory of their own, and Dr. Taylor here falls into this grievous fault. Even if Scripture had been silent on the subject, we should reckon it a strange dilution of the moral lesson taught us by that simple narrative. But we are not left to our own vague speculations. The Spirit of God has condescended, in this instance, to become his own interpreter. “ By faith,” we are told, “ Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous.” And what cause is assigned for the murder ? “ Cain was of the wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him ? Because his own works were evil, and his brother’s righteous.” Not one word is said about ‘ a diverse development of human nature ’ resulting from ‘ diversity of occupation.’ The Holy Spirit leads our thoughts far deeper, and teaches the true solution in the nature of the unrenowned heart, and its bitter dislike to works of faith and living patterns of holiness.

The remarks, in chapter xiv., on the history of the Fall, are a further instance of this rash and hasty theorizing upon Scripture :—

"It is not necessary to enter into any of the countless controversies that have arisen respecting the condition of our first parents in Paradise, the causes of their fall, and the nature of their punishment; but, as some writers have insinuated that a desire for knowledge was an essential part of the transgression of Eve, which seems inconsistent with the connexion that has been shewn between the progress of knowledge and the advancement of humanity, it may be necessary to enter upon a brief examination of the subject.

"Every biblical student is aware that the verb 'to know,' and its derivative 'knowledge,' are used in Hebrew to signify physical perception, at least as frequently as mental reflection. There are fruits which do, in a very remarkable degree, influence our sensations; opium, hemp-seeds, and the juice of the grape, for instance, produce soporific and exhilarating effects. It is, therefore, very possible that the fruit of the tree of knowledge might have had a stimulating efficacy, and might, therefore, for obvious reasons, have been prohibited. The love of excitement is universal in the human race; people will often run into extreme peril for the mere sake of determining how they would feel under such circumstances; and the description of an untried sensation, even though it should be a painful one, excites an earnest desire for its perception. In the prohibition of this fruit, physical results are denounced, not as chastisements, but as natural and necessary consequences. "In the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die;" intimating that the fruit would produce constitutional effects which would render mortality inevitable. Thus viewed, the prohibition ceases to be a capricious test; it becomes a salutary warning, designed, like every other divine law, for the preservation and prosperity of God's creatures. The obedience required was not submission to an arbitrary mandate, but the observance of a condition necessary to their continuance in the paradisiacal state; it was the reasonable adherence to law, not the blind homage to the will of a despot."—(vol. i. pp. 311.)

Now we fully agree with Dr. Taylor, and so will every one who reverences the word of God, that the prohibition was not a capricious test, but a salutary warning; and that obedience would have been a reasonable adherence to law, and not a blind homage to the will of a despot. We would be far also from discouraging a calm and devout inquiry into the moral scope and precise meaning of this affecting and solemn narrative. The author's own solution, indeed, is meagre and superficial; but the subject is too wide to enter upon, and we pass it by. One remark, however, calls for a heavier censure, since it does open violence to the sacred narrative itself. The tendency of his own views is to regard the desire for knowledge as, in all cases, excellent and praiseworthy. Since, however, some writers have insinuated that it 'was an essential part of the transgression of Eve,' he constructs an hypothesis to set aside the objection. But in doing this he strangely overlooks the plain words of Scripture—"When the woman saw that it was a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took, and did eat." That a desire for wisdom had a share in the temptation, is therefore no gloss of interpreters, but a clear and distinct assertion of the Holy Spirit of God.

A still worse specimen of this style of exposition occurs in the next chapter, on patriarchal civilization:—

"The question whether Job was a historical personage or an imaginary character, does not necessarily enter into the consideration of the book as a portraiture of manners, but we may be permitted to hazard a conjecture that a rabbinical error, similar to that which has founded so many legendary fictions on the sixth chapter of Genesis, has been the principal source of all the difficulties against admitting Job's existence. It is now universally conceded that "the sons of God" who took wives from "the daughters of men," were the pious descendants of Seth who intermarried with the offspring of Cain. If the same principle of interpretation be applied to the historical introduction in the Book of Job, the rabbinical gloss that the sons of God mentioned in the sixth verse of the first chapter were angels, and the Satan or accuser, the devil, will appear a very unnecessary difficulty. The simple meaning would be, that when the pious men of Idumea assembled to worship Jehovah, the envious spirit of one or more was excited by the prosperity of Job, and the dialogue between the Satan, that is, the accuser or malignant person, would appear to be nothing more than an ordinary oriental mode of describing the struggles between the suggestions of envy and the dictates of conscience."—(vol. i. pp. 331, 332.)

'This theory,' the author proposes, as he says, 'with all possible humility.' But no diffidence can excuse his obtruding on his readers so baseless a theory, framed in the worst mould of German neology. In the first place, his assertion as to the passage in Genesis is unfounded. The exposition to which he refers has obtained a wide currency in modern times, but it has never been universal, and of late, there has been an extensive recurrence to the earlier view. But if the assumption be erroneous, the theory here grounded upon it is even worse. An 'envious Idumean' returns "from going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it!" This same 'malignant' neighbour of the patriarch, according to the novel explanation "went forth and smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown." Surely to such ridiculous glosses the reproof applies in all its force; "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?"

In truth, the too general disbelief or neglect, among professing Christians, of spiritual agency, and supernatural power not simply divine, is one dark and infidel feature of the present day. From the gross superstitions of the middle ages we are recoiling into a habit of total unbelief. It is hard to say which extreme is the more perilous. The enlightened Christian will feel it his duty to resist this proud, superficial scepticism in every form, but most of all when it would strain and turn aside the plain import of the oracles of God. Believing firmly in the vastness of that spiritual world which is above, and beneath, and on every side, he will not suffer one avenue of light to be closed which the divine oracles themselves have opened into those regions of mystery and wonder.

There are many passages, however, in which a happier vein of thought prevails. We may select two from the second volume, one for the interest of its facts, and the other for the truth and im-

portance of the reflections. The first will be found in the opening page :—

“ In the last century, the Books of Moses were often attacked, and their authenticity impugned, because they mention the existence of vineyards, grapes, and consequently of wine, in Egypt; for Herodotus expressly declares there were no vineyards in Egypt, and Plutarch avers that the natives of that country abhorred wine, as being the blood of those who rebelled against the gods. This authority appeared conclusive, not merely to the sceptics who impugned the veracity of the Pentateuch, but even to the learned Michaelis, who concluded that the use of wine was enjoined in the sacrifice for the purpose of making a broad distinction between the religious usages of the Israelites and of the Egyptians. The monuments opened by modern research have decided the controversy in favour of the Jewish legislator. In the subterranean vaults at Eilithyia every part of the processes connected with the dressing and tending of the vine are faithfully delineated; the trellices on which the vines were trained, the care with which they were watered, the collection of the fruit, the treading of the wine-press, and the stowing of the wine in *amphoræ*, or vases, are there painted to the life; and additional processes of extracting the juice from the grape are represented, which seem to have been peculiar to the Egyptian people. Mr. Jomard adds, that the remains of *amphoræ*, or wine-vessels, have been found in the ruins of old Egyptian cities, which are still encrusted with the tartar deposited by the wine.

“ It is not necessary to account for the error into which Herodotus has fallen; he wrote long after Egypt had been distracted by civil wars, and then subdued by the Persians; calamities quite sufficient to account for the disappearance of such a highly artificial cultivation as that of the vine must have been in Egypt. His statement is most probably correct, if it be limited to the period when Herodotus wrote; and thus viewed it becomes important evidence for the superior antiquity both of the Bible and the Egyptian monuments.”—(vol. ii. pp. 1—3.)

How many a cavil thrown out by sceptics against the word of God, has, like the present, vanished into thin air before the light of more close and searching enquiry. It is only the false glosses upon Scripture and upon science, which can ever bring them into seeming collision. The works, the word, and the providence of God, will, at the last, be found united in the closest and fullest harmony.

The other passage occurs in the remarks on the Decline of Polytheism :—

“ An established system of opinions must frequently rest for its main support on simple acquiescence in its forms; but it is exposed to serious danger if it does not widen this basis by explaining the forms, shewing their significance, and presenting evidence for the truth they contain. Inquiry will come, whether it be desired or not; scepticism will develope itself, and when it finds no solution for its doubts, will reject the system altogether. And this result cannot be affected by the greater or less amount of absolute truth in the doctrines, for that absolute truth does not become a moral truth until it is established by proof in the understanding.

“ Doubt is too frequently treated as a crime, and attributed either to obliquity of intellect or hardness of heart; but doubt is a necessary accompaniment of a spirit of inquiry and research, and its first movements are rather proofs of amity than hostility to an established creed. The earliest desire of scepticism is to discover in the prevalent doctrines something that may justify former belief in them, satisfy the present good-will towards them, and firmly esta-

blish them for the future, on the basis of enlightened conviction. It will not do to tell such a mind that doubt is sinful, and more perilous is it to check or punish the desire for procuring the solution of difficulties: if this be done, the result is certain; mild scepticism will be changed into confirmed hostility to the doctrines. The system if true—and if its truth be not concealed and corrupted by antiquated forms, which have been perverted in the course of centuries, by the ambition of some, or the ignorance of others—will afford the honest inquirers what they seek, and they will thus attain a more settled conviction and firm faith than if they had never doubted. But if it be false, or if its truth be so corrupted by the abuses of centuries as to become a virtual falsehood, scepticism soon becomes confirmed, and the ancient system is rejected, at once and for ever.

“The sceptics proclaim their discoveries, and are, at first, derided by the whole world. But doubt once proclaimed, rapidly insinuates itself into the public mind, and ere long, those who govern in the name of the ancient faith discover that the foundation of their power is shaken. The formularies which in the age of quiet submission passed without challenge, now prove faithless to their masters; they contain no elements of self-defence, for the truth by which they first won supremacy has been long since forgotten; the possessors of power, therefore, have recourse to physical force, and this appears to the reflective part of mankind a tacit acknowledgment that their cause can no longer be maintained by reason or argument. But, in the struggle, a time comes when the innovators are perplexed by their very success; they are all-powerful to destroy, but they are unable to supply the void which they create; they find that scepticism cannot long survive its victim; man in the long run requires some positive belief, because he knows that truth has existence somewhere. The innovators hasten to supply the deficiency; but they are no longer unanimous, each has a system of his own, and they soon begin to hate each other more than the common enemy. This is the crisis of the revolution.”—(vol. ii. pp. 144—147.)

Professor Sewell, we remember, in his ‘Christian Morals,’ lays down broadly the opposite maxim, that in all cases ‘belief is a virtue, and doubt is a sin.’ The remarks of our author are far more scriptural, and shew a juster and sounder view of the laws of human thought. Every attempt, indeed, to stifle inquiry, will fail, and ought to fail. God demands of us a readiness and openness to believe, on sufficient evidence; but a faith without evidence He never requires; nay, His word condemns it in the strongest terms. Maxims like that of the professor, are a short and easy method for turning all men into blind bigots or presumptuous unbelievers. Amidst the manifold defects of the work now before us, this advocacy of a voracious credulity, as the only antidote for scepticism, is one from which it is entirely free.

The following paragraph, again, is very instructive to liberals of the modern school:—

“Irreligion acquired supremacy at Rome when liberty was lost. After all that has been said of the coalition between hierarchies and arbitrary power, it is undeniable that the coalition between despotism and infidelity is a thousand times more perilous. A religious people may be enslaved, but an irreligious people never can be free. The very first element of rational liberty, a deep sense of responsibility, is wanting: there are no checks to selfishness, no incentives to disinterested conduct. This also was the era of astrologers, sorcerers, and magicians. Nero invited sorcerers to Rome, that he might be

initiated in their secrets. Adrian was a professed student of witchcraft. Alexander Severus, Dioclesian, and Constantine before his conversion, endeavoured by magical practices to dive into the secrets of futurity. Spells and incantations were employed by all classes to obtain the aid of the mysterious powers of darkness; and it seemed as if men had abandoned the worship of the gods to follow that of devils."—(vol. ii. pp. 154—156.)

We fear that our own times are not unlikely, before long, to confirm the lesson taught in this mournful picture. Unbelief and credulity are very nearly allied. Should some grand convulsion wrap Europe once more in the flames of war, an infidel populace, maddened by passion, and thirsting for blood, would be found a ready prey to the most wretched delusions of hell. Nothing but the fear of God can preserve the soul, in times of passionate excitement, from a credulous worship of the powers of darkness.

The following chapters contain many useful observations, with some incidental errors, and not a little false philosophy and spurious candour. The worst specimen of latitudinarian speculation occurs in the tenth chapter, on the features of society in the Middle Ages. The reader will be startled with the following broad assertion:—

"There is probably no part of the Romish creed, and not one of the Romish institutions, that was not of vast importance in the great struggle which the church had to maintain; and of the doctrines and practices on which the nineteenth century passes just sentence of condemnation, there is scarcely one which could have been spared, seven hundred years ago, without imminent peril to the great cause of human civilization and social happiness. In the great majority of instances, the errors were forced upon the ecclesiastical body; and in all the rest, the error arose from attempting to render universal some formulary that had been devised for a special purpose."—(vol. ii. pp. 214, 215.)

The dangerous character of such statements is almost neutralized, we should hope, by their monstrous and palpable absurdity. Doctrines, it seems, which are now justly condemned for their falsehood, could not have been spared without peril seven hundred years ago; and the deadly error of to-day becomes the golden truth of to-morrow! The bare statement of such absurdities is their best refutation. We are astonished how a writer in many respects so sensible could bring himself to utter such contemptible trash, much more that he should pass it off upon himself and his readers as deep philosophy.

Another passage stamped with the same character follows in the next page:—

"The power of the papacy, as an institution, was directly proportioned to the strength of the opinion on which it was founded, and the strength of that opinion must be measured by the circumstances by which it was engendered. It is necessary to keep this philosophic truth steadily in view, because one of the most common arguments urged against the civilizing influences of Christianity, is the alleged delinquencies of the church in the Middle Ages. But if we take into consideration the nature of the times in which these delinquencies are said to have occurred, we may perhaps discover that what we

have censured merits our eulogy, and what we have scorned deserves our gratitude. It is not enough to shew that Christianity as first taught, was a blessing: we must further shew that through the whole course of its history, it has been a benefactor to humanity."—(vol. ii. pp. 216, 217.)

We cannot protest too strongly, in the name of truth and righteousness, against this impure candour, this empty show of philosophical thought, and real surrender of Divine truth. No falsehood can be more baneful and ruinous than to make Christianity responsible for all the crimes and follies which have been committed in its name. This is to betray Christ afresh into the hands of sinners. The effects of his heavenly doctrine must be traced in the lives of those who receive it with the heart, and not in the history of those who first corrupt it into pernicious heresies, and then disgrace it by their profligacy and crimes. To confound Christianity with the visible church, and the visible church with the papacy, is a twofold error of the grossest kind, and wherever received, must lead to a thousand ruinous delusions.

The whole of the remarks on the Reformation partake of the same lax and superficial tone. We are told, for instance, that Hildebrand was not less a reformer than Luther—that the Reformation would equally have taken place if Luther, Calvin, or Zuinglius had never been born—and that Luther, 'did not always comprehend the nature and purpose of his mission, for he more than once stood aghast at the necessary consequences of his own actions;' with much besides in a still more supercilious tone, about the 'impudence' of that 'coarse, vulgar-minded man.' Now all this is to our taste, equally sickening and ridiculous. It seems like scraps gathered from some dreaming sceptic of the French school, rather than the grave sentiments of a Christian writer. Stripped of all disguise, what lessons do these sentences convey? That the man who brought the predicted apostasy almost to its height, by "forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats," is no less a reformer of Christ's church, than the boldest champion of the doctrine of faith since the time of the apostles; that the Reformation was not a mighty work of Divine grace, acting through fit instruments chosen of God himself, but the mere result of a blind and fatal necessity; and that a writer who thinks that seven hundred years can change truth into falsehood, with equal reason thinks himself fit to sit in judgment on the greatest of the reformers.

But we turn from a subject, which our respect for the writer, in spite of his occasional follies and frequent errors, renders painful and repulsive, and pass to a redeeming extract from his closing chapter:—

"Having shewn the truth of the celebrated aphorism—that 'society existed before the individual,' we proceeded to establish the improbability, or rather the utter impossibility, of society having been constituted or

framed by an individual or individuals. Such a theory involved the obvious contradiction, that man had a knowledge of the benefits of society antecedent to all experience, because antecedent to the very existence of society. Since, then, a certain stock of knowledge, a certain amount of civilization, was as necessary to be provided for man in the outset, as food is for the insect when it breaks the egg in its proper nidus, and as man could not have derived this stock from his internal resources, we proceeded to search for that external cause which enabled humanity to employ its own treasures, use its own talents, and complete the development of its own faculties. We had not far to seek: we found that in the intellectual and moral, not less than in the physical and material world, "the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth;" and that civilization, like every other "good and perfect gift," originally came down from "the Father of Lights," in whom there is no variableness nor shadow of turning.'

"Then—but not till then—we examined how far the conclusions to which we had been led, by reasoning and analysis, were in accordance with the narrative of the early history of our race contained in the Holy Scriptures. We found reason and revelation in complete accordance; they perfectly harmonized together, and thus enforced conviction that both were derived from the same God. This was a matter too interesting to ourselves individually—too important to the world generally—to be lightly dismissed. We therefore scrutinized the sacred records, taking care that the spirit of reverence should control, but not check, the spirit of criticism: and we proved, by experience, that the spirit of criticism thus directed gave new life and strength to the spirit of reverence. • • • • •

"We saw everywhere that with nations, as with individuals, every deviation from the path of rectitude was a step on the road to ruin; every element of civilization perverted and misapplied, was changed into a potent means of destruction; and when once the process of corruption was begun, it proceeded, if unchecked, with an accelerated velocity, until iniquity consummated its work, and wrote its irrevocable *Ichabod* on mouldering fane and ruined palaces."—(vol. ii. pp. 341—343.)

These are paragraphs worthy of a Christian writer, and the truths which they contain, however simple in themselves, are of deep and everlasting moment. May their lessons sink deep into the heart of our own favoured country, and of all who guide our national counsels.

In closing these remarks, we must again express our deep regret at the absence of large and comprehensive views of providence, and the lax and unsound statements by which this work is disfigured. The subject is one of growing interest in these times of changes, when all the world is combining into one vast family, though at present, far, alas, from a family of love. Our readers will find in its pages many instructive and entertaining materials of thought, collected with a benevolent purpose; but they will do well not to rely too much on the author's judgment; and to test all his theories, throughout the work, in the light of Divine truth, and by the unerring oracles of God. If the largeness and grandeur of its views, the soundness of its doctrine, and the vigour of its style, had been equal to the beauty of the design, the writer would have laid the church under a deep and lasting obligation.

THE CHERWELL WATER-LILY, and other Poems. By the
REV. FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, M.A., Fellow of University
 College, Oxford. London: *Rivingtons.* 1840.

THIS volume is the production of one who is a poet of nature's own composition—one who is a poet by instinct and by impulse, not by academical exercises and Walker's rhyming lexicon—one whom "the gods have made poetical." We have wished, however, again and again that we could apply to it the significant and sensible comment of Touchstone, that 'the truest poetry is the most feigning; that lovers are given to poetry, and that what they swear in poetry, may be said, as lovers, they do feign.'* Whether Mr. Faber is a lover, we do not pretend to have discovered from the ambiguous initials which are prefixed to several of the minor poems; from the beginning, however, it is quite clear that he suspects himself—and before we are midway through the volume there seems no little ground to hope that his own suspicion is now more than half confirmed:—

———"among stout-hearted men
 Some truant monks there be;
 And, if you could their names collect,
 I rather more than half suspect
 That I should not be free.

Erewhile I dreamed of cloistered cells,
 Of gloomy courts and matin bells,
 And painted windows rare;
 But common life's less real gleams
 Shone warm on my monastic dreams,
 And melted them to air."—(p. 144.)

We will therefore gladly give the author the benefit of our doubt; and as, while he has said many beautiful things, he has "sworn" some strange things, in poetry, we will indulge him in the lover's privilege, and believe that 'he does feign.'

Seriously speaking, this volume must be judged not only by its execution, but also by its object and design. Viewed as a collection of poems, into which any measure or degree of fiction is admissible, nay, of which fiction is the essence; imagination the only rule, and fancy the only guide—wherein the author throws the rein carelessly over the neck of his Pegasus, and vaults he cares not whither and heeds not wherefore—viewed and regarded in *this* light, it is, to say the least, one of the most graceful and delicate poetical bouquets which for a long time have been presented to the public—dropping

* "As you like it."

the most fragrant incense, and redolent of "odours rained from heaven." If however it be designed as a manual of theology in verse; if it be intended to present us, not with 'echoes of church bells' but with statements of church doctrines—if it be meant, in the attractive guise and "golden cadence" of poesy, to insinuate Mr. Faber's views of the most momentous and mysterious articles of our faith—the services and sacraments of the church, the nature and efficacy of penitential observances, and the fearful mystery of the 'middle home,' the after state, which appears in his verse as a kind of qualified or mitigated purgatory—we must assuredly class him among the advocates of what Bishop Shuttleworth has happily denominated 'a trifling and fanciful theology.' The form of Christianity which his verse embodies, is "at once arbitrary and servile." We have in it not only the revival of obsolete and almost forgotten opinions; not only the cumbrous superadditions, not to say, cold superstitions, of a later and far less pure period than that of the Apostles; but we have speculations and theories on the most important topics, which are the fantastic coinage of Mr. Faber's own brain; and very different, as it appears to us, from the impression stamped by a Hand Divine on the "words of the Lord, which are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times"—impressions, which when deep and distinct, cannot be obliterated or obscured by human hand. That we may do no injustice to Mr. Faber, however, in a work which professes, and we are sure intends, to render justice to all, we will speak first of his poetry and then of his theology. Much, very much, we acknowledge, does this collection of poems contain, which is calculated to refine and elevate, as well as to delight and enchant the reader who has music in his soul;—so pure is the volume in its morals and so pleasing in its melodies, that we should not fear to trust even the youth and the virgin in this charming labyrinth, if only forewarned that it was a region of fancy, and forearmed with the infallible clue; if only pre-monished, that all which glitters is not gold, and that there is no small quantity of Mr. Faber's glitter, which, when subjected to the ordeal of Scripture, will be at once evaporated into smoke or transmuted into dross.

They who profess to classify poetry—to arrange that which disdains all order, and regulate that which despises all form—may talk in good set terms about the poetry of description, and the poetry of feeling, and the poetry of passion, and the poetry of taste—but Mr. Faber, in common with every man of true poetic inspiration, has shown that this is mere solemn trifling—the shallow cant and commonplace of criticism—that the various kinds of poetry blend into each other as beautifully and as imperceptibly as the ming-

ling tints of the rainbow, and that, with few and rare exceptions, he who excels in one excels in all. Assuredly, Mr. Faber's most vivid and exquisite descriptions are prolific of the most natural and touching effusions of the heart—it is when he is walking forth amid the woods and by the waters, encompassed by nature in her wildest, simplest, loveliest forms, that the fire seems to kindle within him, and to issue forth in “thoughts that breathe and words that burn.” The Book of Nature is to him as a mirror, in which are reflected the secret windings and intricacies of the human heart—the latent springs and sources of its gushing passions—the movements of the imprisoned spark of immortality, which seems as if struggling to be free, and streams through the aperture of its chamber in the heart, and blazes up into heaven, though all too soon

“ Relapsing into darkness, as before.

What can be more exquisite than the subjoined stanzas, and who would not make a pilgrimage to what Mr. Faber somewhat presumptuously calls the “City of God,” to realize such thoughts in such a spot?

“ There is a well, a willow-shaded spot,
Cool in the noontide gleam,
With rushes nodding in the little stream,
And blue forget-me-not;
Set in thick tufts along the bushy marge,
With big bright eyes of gold,
And glorious water-plants, like fans, unfold
Their blossoms strange and large.
That wandering boy, young Hylas, did not find
Beauties so rich and rare,
Where swallow-wort and pale-bright maiden's hair
And dog-grass greenly twined.
A sloping bank ran round it like a crown,
Whereon a purple cloud
Of dark wild hyacinths, a fairy crowd,
Had settled softly down.
And dreamy sounds of never-ending bells,
From Oxford's holy towers,
Came down the stream, and went among the flowers,
And died in little swells.
There did I keep my birth-day feast, with all
These gentle things around,
While their soft voices rising from the ground
Unto my heart did call.
It is not good to be without a home,—
Young hearts should not be free :
Yet household thoughts have long been closed to me
Within my father's tomb.

And I have roamed through places fair and good,
 Like a wild bird that drops
 To rest somewhere among the thousand tops
 Of a broad fir-wood.

My love hath strewn in many a youthful breast
 Fancies of tender mould,
 And I have memories among the old
 In their eternal rest.

Sunny and wild all earthly things do seem,
 Like an enchanter's show,
 And yet it frets me all the while to know
 That this is but a dream.

I cannot burst the fetters of the spell :—
 The silvery light of mirth
 Streams from within me over all the earth,
 As from an endless well.

So bright of late the unsetting sun hath played,
 Its evening must be near,
 When hope shall win fresh loveliness from fear,
 And memory from shade.

Still by old hills or abbey's ruined shrine
 Shall love my footsteps bring—
 Dear homes, where friendship set me gathering
 These wild-flower thoughts of mine."—(pp. 128—131.)

We are strongly tempted to quote the poem numbered LXVIII., notwithstanding the strange title which it bears ;—"The Feast of the Invention of the Holy Cross," which has little to do with the subject of the poem, and concerning which we are glad to find, by the only scrap of earthborn prose intermingled with his poetical flowers, that Mr. Faber thinks the historical evidence for the legend quite insufficient. For once, we agree with him most entirely. We should almost as soon be inclined to credit the ingenious hypothesis on which Paulinus accounts for the fact, that within less than a century after its discovery by Helena, the relics of the true cross had enlarged to ten times the dimensions of the original tree ; viz. 'that the wood was miraculously increased, without any change in its substance, in order to gratify the earnest desires of the faithful.' We do not however indulge our inclination, because the "ancient pleasure ground," of which he speaks,

"Close by a languid river, where the spring
 'Mid bursting buds and flowers, was rioting,"

is no other than the ground of St. John's College in the sister University ; and we think, were we to quote Mr. Faber's verses at full length, that the 'dwellers in that holy house' would almost be too much in love with the seclusion of their mystic scene to take that active part in the mortal strife between the conflicting powers of good and evil, which befits men who are especially

consecrated to the holy warfare of the cross. We will however gratify both ourselves and our readers by extracting the 15th poem, entitled 'Oxford in Spring,' headed with the appropriate motto 'Templa quam delecta,' and lxxii. 'Cambridge (we presume) in Summer.' We certainly cannot tax Mr. Faber with any backwardness to discern, or any reluctance to eulogize, the beauties of the twin sister of her, who is the goddess of his idolatry, or at least the mother of his love; but we can scarcely understand why he designates Granta, 'a voiceless place'—'a place of mute shrines,' if by shrines are to be understood in plain, honest, homespun prose, 'College Chapels.' We are not aware that there is a single shrine without a voice, and a voice which speaks both at morning prime and evening grey with accents which will not be heard in vain. However, we can with equal fervor of filial affection adopt and apply Mr. Faber's motto 'Templa quam delecta;' for the temples of Cambridge also are illuminated by the presence of Him who is the glory of the latter house, and of every place where 'incense is offered to His name, with the pure offering' of contrite and lowly prayer. There "Christ is preached—and in this we do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." Mr. Faber will, we are sure, permit us, without settling the question of precedence between Cantaber or even Edward the Elder and Alfred, to apply to both Universities his own beautiful lines, on the two united and inseparable rivers—the Brathay and the Rothay.

"One decks the eastern vale—the loveliest;
The other dashes onward from the west.
They join in quiet fields: you scarce can know
Which was the first to join.
Then in a lake they blend their kindred flow,
And men do say, and so it ought to be,
That they in one bright stream pass onward to the sea."—(p. 72.)

" OXFORD IN SPRING.

How gentle are the days that bring
The promise of the faithful year,
Sweet early pledges of the spring,
Sweetest while winter still is near;
Like thoughts in time of sorrow given,
Filling the heart with glowing types of Heaven!

The little buds upon the thorn
Are peeping from their pale green hood;
Pink rows of almond-flowers adorn
With many a gem the leafless wood,
And gaily on the vernal breeze
Dance the light tassels of the hazel-trees.

The early rose is blushing sweet
In yonder sunny sheltered place,
Where spring and winter seem to meet
And blend with wild fantastic grace,

And under skies of coldest blue
 The crocus fills her yellow cup with dew.
 The sun shines on the city walls,
 The meadows fair, and elmy woods,
 And o'er her grey and time-stained halls
 Religion's quiet spirit broods,
 And calls world-wearied men to come
 And find within these stately aisles a home.
 The joy of holy hearts art thou,—
 The jewel of our country dear!
 The fount from whence fresh rivers flow
 To pour their blessings far and near;
 Where still with purest incense rise
 The steams of morn and evening sacrifice!
 Thy hallowed bounds a precinct give
 Where forms of ancient greatness stay,
 Enduring truths that shall outlive
 The jarring systems of a day;
 Therefore with men of evil will
 Thou sitt'st, dear city, calm and fearless still!
 And now, when all things round are bright,
 Those voiceless towers so tranquil seem,
 And yet so solemn in their might,
 A loving heart could almost deem
 That they themselves might conscious be
 That they were filled with immortality!—(p. 49.)

“CAMBRIDGE.

Ah me! were ever river-banks so fair,
 Gardens so fit for nightingales as these?
 Were ever haunts so meet for summer breeze,
 Or pensive walk in evening's golden air?
 Was ever town so rich in court and tower
 To woo and win stray moonlight every hour?
 One thing thou lackest much: the wild wind swells,
 The feast-days come, and yet night silent falls
 On the poor listening stream and patient halls;
 Thou art a voiceless place,—thou hast no bells.
 Yea, but for thy mute shrines, thou wert a town
 That might Grey Oxford's vocal towers disdain,
 Where Isis flows and Cherwell ripples down,
 Timing their several voices to the strain!—(p. 258.)

We might proceed to adorn our pages with many flowers of equal fragrance and beauty; but we diverge to a less pleasing task, though one which may prove in how high estimation we hold the volume before us. Mr. Faber writes, we presume—he is fully competent to do so—for what man calls immortality. Whether their influence be for good or for evil, many of these poems are made of the material that will endure, even though put forth in an age the very antagonist of musings and meditations; an age, in which poetry, to use the phraseology of the market, is a drug, and one which the public strangely seems to nauseate. We would

therefore intreat Mr. Faber to correct certain defects of style, of manner, and of sentiment, which we now proceed to indicate ; and we do this in honest anticipation of a name which posterity will class with those of Heber and of Milman. May the hope be more than realized—and may the wreath all be without a weed !

Mr. Faber is generally to be commended for the ‘varying verse, the full resounding tone,’ if not for the ‘long majestic march,’ which he may reserve for yet higher undertakings, and a more substantial effort of poetic inspiration. But what right has he to expect, that even in the most irregular and probationary excursions of a regularly-trained Oxford Prize-poet we should tolerate such vapid feebleness as

———“ an ethereal buoyancy, that bore
ME up upon the wings of power.”

And again—

“ From out the unpolluted dead
Their names may not be gathered :
They dwell too deep for man to find
THEM out in their calm mirth.”

and once more ; with a double pronominal termination, more odious even than the insignificant initial, which might well consign the Poem in which it appears to perpetual immersion beneath the waters of the Cherwell ;

“ The best of earthly joys is *that*
Which scorneth not to borrow
Its charms, if chance permit, from *its*
Relationship to sorrow.”

Is this poetry, Mr. Faber ? Is it even measured and melodious prose ? It has no more title to appear in a volume of poetry like yours, than “the last new novel” in Dr. Pusey’s edition of the Fathers.

Some few instances of bad taste are perceptible ; for example :—

———“ Things did seem
All near and big, like mountains before rain.”

It is as much as we can do to tolerate the ‘big tear,’ which professes to be tragedy ; but a big mountain is downright farce. Mr. Faber, with all his undoubted and indisputable talent, cannot naturalize ‘big’ in poetry. The sooner he renounces it the better ; and along with it his favourite expression, “mayhap :”

“ These, with the storms and calms, mayhap,
Enough of sight and sound would make
For one in mountain nature’s lap.”

It may be said, that this passage appears in a very different

light when separated from the context. This is true; but Mr. Faber ought to know, that a perfect poem (and he is very capable of producing such) ought to bear examination in every one of its parts. A little more of the 'limæ labor' is indispensable, and the 'præsectus unguis' had better receive a tenth correction than be suffered thus to continue, to the detriment of the whole figure—or to vary the metaphor, if Pegasus has gone lame, he requires to be re-shod. The last of these offences against good taste we shall find in the description of the Young Novice, p. 17, where, not to mention an objection which we are sure will present itself to Mr. Faber's own mind on a second reading, we have the following prettiness, quite unworthy of genuine and sterling talent like Mr. Faber's :

“ And read that love, which words may not express,
In the pale depth of their blue silentness.”

What, in the name of philosophy and common sense, is the meaning of these two epithets? Are the eyes of the fair novice 'pale' because they are 'deep,' or 'deep' because they are 'pale'—'blue' because they are 'silent,' or 'silent' because they are 'blue?' Would there have been any conceivable difference if the poet had written,

In the deep paleness of their silent blue?

Try this experiment of convertibility on any lines of Pope, Byron, Southey, or in his loftier moods, of Faber, and what will be the result?

Homer occasionally went off into a doze, and we must not expect Mr. Faber to be always wide awake. In the next edition of his work, however—for without the magical apparatus of Bacon's mirror or Banquo's glass we predict that there will be

“ Another yet—a seventh?
And yet the eighth appears! ”—

we would recommend him to revise Poem LXV. entitled 'Childhood,' and addressed 'To my only Sister,' in which it is rather strange to read,

“ Albeit we fondly hoped, when we were *men*,
To learn the lore our parents loved so well: ”

and afterwards to find the author speaking to a young lady of 'living through manhood upon what we love.' Mr. Faber must not, however, expunge the poem. Rather than do this he will resort, we hope, to the alternative of creating, for poetical purposes, an only brother. We could pardon many inaccuracies for the sake

of the concluding stanza, which is enough to stamp the writer a poet of no secondary class :

“ Christian ! thy dream is now—it was not then :
 Oh ! it were strange if childhood were a dream.
 Strife and the world are dreams : to wakeful men
 Childhood and home as jealous Angels seem :
 Like shapes and hues that play in clouds at even,
 They have but shifted from thee into Heaven ! ”

Having thus endeavoured to afford an impartial view of Mr. Faber's poetry, alike in its strength and its weakness, its excellences and defects ; having traced, with sincere and honest gratulation, the rising of a new star in the poetical horizon, which has given such hopeful promise of future brightness and beauty, we proceed to a far less grateful task—the consideration of Mr. Faber's theology. We wish we could bring ourselves to consider this as mere indulgence in the poet's proverbial licence, and to believe that it was merely the unrestrained effusion of an exuberant fancy ; but we fear that the Author himself would repudiate this charitable supposition, and entrench himself behind the rampart of that very convenient antiquity, which comes just near enough to primitive Christianity to afford countenance to error, without deriving authority from truth. Which of the Apostles, or of the apostolic Fathers (we must not hint at the Reformers) would justify Mr. Faber in stating, or rather introducing the Church personified to state, the following reason for the observance of the Rogation days :

“ Ye are weak, and cannot bear
 Full forty days of Easter mirth ;
 And nought is left unstained on earth
 But penance, fast, and prayer.”

Now, ‘ to fast with this persuasion of mind, that our fasting and our good works can make us perfect and just men, and finally bring us to heaven, is a devilish persuasion ; and that fast is so far off from pleasing God, that it refuseth His mercy, and is altogether derogatory from the mercies of Christ,’ (*Homily on Fasting.*) What need indeed of the merits of Christ's death to make fasting acceptable to God, if it is ‘ unstained ’ on earth ? We should have supposed this epithet exclusively applicable to HIM, who “ Himself without spot or stain of sin, came to make us pure from all sin.” We should have supposed the only ‘ unstained ’ fast ever observed upon earth to be that which was kept by the Son of Man, when “ he was driven into the wilderness, and was forty days tempted of the devil.”

But Mr. Faber, in addition to his ‘ unstained fasts,’ has put forth in his verse another means of replenishing the treasury of

supererogatory merit—even 'redeeming alms.' In his version of the saying of St. Hermas, he affirms what St. Hermas never did—or if he had, would most certainly have been struck out of the calendar of saints by any council which had met in days before apostolic purity had become a thing of the past :

" Empty on priests and heathen lands
And widows pale thy willing hands:
While prince and peer of old names dream.
Let alms thy sin-pledged soul redeem."

We *had* thought, that we were "redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ." We *had* thought, that it was "not by works of righteousness which we had done, but according to God's mercy that we were saved." We *had* understood the Church to say, in her tenth article, "that we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not for our own works or deservings." We *had* been instructed by her to regard those as "reasonable and godly, who most certainly know and persuade themselves, that all goodness, all bounty, all mercies, all benefits, all forgiveness of sins, and whatsoever can be named good or profitable, either for the body or the soul (how much more then of all redemption,) do come only of God's mercy and mere favour; so that though they do render so many and so excellent good deeds, yet are they never puffed up with vain confidence of them—but rather with the humble and poor Publican confess themselves sinful wretches, and unworthy to look up to heaven, calling and craving for mercy, that with the Publican they may be pronounced of Christ to be justified," (*Homily on Alms-deeds.*) Yet, says Mr. Faber, 'let alms thy sin-pledged soul redeem?' If this be meant for doctrinal truth, it is downright falsehood; if for poetic fiction, it is most lamentably misplaced. He continues,

" Wide, churchman, is thy mother's field,
A hundredfold her valleys yield."

But however wide, or however prolific, there is not through the whole one such noxious weed, one such root of bitterness, one such soul-perverting, soul-destroying error as this!

We have no time nor space nor disposition to enlarge. When Mr. Faber attaches such primary importance to turning eastward in the creed, he is only giving an undue exaltation to that which is in its nature non-essential. Equally so when he writes of "Church Postures,"

" Ye would not sit at ease while meek men kneel
Did ye but see His face shine through the veil,

And the unearthly forms that round you steal
 Hidden in beauteous light, splendid or pale
 As the rich service leads. And prostrate faith
 Shroudeth her timorous eye, while through the air
 Hovers and hangs the Spirit's cleansing breath
 In Whitsun shapes o'er each true worshipper.
 Deep wreaths of angels, burning from the east,
 Around the consecrated shrine are braced,
 The awful stone where by fit hands are placed
 The flesh and blood of the tremendous feast.
 But kneel—the bishop on the altar-stair
 Will bring a blessing out of Sion there.”—(p. 312.)

We do not clearly understand, whether he means to deny a blessing only to those dissenters who receive the sacred symbols in a sitting posture; or to any congregation in which they are not ministered by “fit hands,” (though “the unworthiness of the minister hindereth not the effect of the Sacraments;”) or where “the Bishop on the altar-stair” is not present to bring a “blessing out of Sion.” The Apostle might have taught him a different lesson where he says, “Peace be with all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.” But when Mr. Faber terms water

—————“holiest element,
 Wherein the power of our new birth is laid.”

why does he ascribe to the symbol what can only be accomplished by that mighty and mysterious influence which it typifies? “Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.” True it is, that in either poem he terms it, the ‘gifted water’—but what were the water without the gift? and if his views of baptism are of universal application, and the ‘child baptized at Ambleside’ is the representative of an entire class, how can it be positively said of one who might hereafter rush into “wretchlessness of most unclean living,” and perish in mortal sin:

“Now thou art consecrate, fair thing!
 A church where sinners have not prayed—
 A shrine where only angels sing—
 A corner-stone in Zion laid!”

Far better would it be, far wiser, to adopt the cautious language of the Church, and to make it the theme and topic of humble and hearty prayer ‘that the child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning.’

We had marked for censure Mr. Faber's notions of the ‘Middle State,’ p. 37, which seems to us little better than a revival of “that fond thing purgatory,” dexterously mantled and muffled in a veil of mystery:

“ Alms-deeds and praise and vigils past
 In penitential prayer and fast,
 Boldness in faith, and wrongs forgiven,
 And self-denying toils for heaven,
 And gentleness in strife.
 These follow all the souls that come
 Unto their rest and middle home ;
 And by their sides for ever stay
 To witness at the solemn day,—
 In fear, as nigher still and nigher
 They see the cleansing judgment-fire.”—(p. 60.)

And his admiration of the ‘ missal’s mystic blue and gold,’ which, notwithstanding their vow of celibacy, he strangely designates ‘ the work of my monastic sires ;’ — but enough, we think, has already been said to enable the reflective reader, by a reference to sure standards and first principles, to form his judgment concerning the theology of the work in general. We know the book *will* be read—we would not that it should be read without a caution—for if Mr. Faber be one of the most delightful of companions on the banks of the Isis and the Cherwell, he is assuredly a most unsafe guide to the “ river that maketh glad the city of God.” If he be not himself, through the infinite mercy of God, in danger of forsaking “ the fountain of living waters,” he has certainly incurred the other of “ two evils,” in “ hewing out broken cisterns which will hold no water.” Never—while the word shall stand firm, which will survive the disruption and dissolution of the universe—never will ‘ alms a sin-pledged soul redeem ;’ nor will Latin litanies thrill on the soul ‘ in time of sinning,’ with a cadence which will break the spell. We fervently hope that in a new and expurgated edition of this work the blemishes may be annihilated, and the beauties may survive—that if Mr. Faber’s poetry be still the poetry of fiction, his theology at least may be the theology of truth. “ Thy word is truth.” There is some hope of this blessed consummation ; for he tells us, in the ‘ Farewell to the Reader :’

“ these fitful strains keep blending,
 Poorly yet truly, strivings gained or lost,
 By one in whom two tempers are contending,
 Neither of which have yet come uppermost.”

And he had already said to some nameless friend (p. 305)—

“ weary not if I do still
 New light or gloom disclose :
 What else, in sooth, can poets be,
 But men whom no one knows ? ”

He will forgive us, if we pray earnestly that ‘ new light ’ may be disclosed in his next work, and that it may be ‘ light from heaven ;’ that one temper may ‘ come uppermost,’ and that it may be “ the mind that was in Christ.”

CHURCH PRINCIPLES *considered in their results.* By W. E. GLADSTONE, Esq., M.P. 8vo. Murray. 1840.

‘CHURCH principles!’—what are they;—or rather, what is meant by this somewhat novel phrase? This is a question which we have often asked ourselves; and we are happy to find, at last, some kind of an answer supplied to us, by the hand of a gentleman, a scholar, and a Christian; who is himself one of the most attractive members of that involuntary association by whom this new phrase has been coined and brought into use.

This feeling of curiosity induced us, in the first place, to search the present volume for some account or statement of what these ‘Church Principles’ were considered to be. And though rather deficient in clear definitions, Mr. Gladstone’s work supplied us with one or two hasty outlines, which, we suppose, may be taken to be accurate sketches, as far as they extend, of the notions which are dignified by this somewhat high-sounding phrase.

“I shall attempt, in the first instance, to present a familiar, or at least a partial, representation of the moral characteristics and effects of those doctrines which are now perhaps more than ever felt in the English Church to be full of intrinsic value, and which likewise appear to have so much of special adaptation to the circumstances of the time. They are, particularly, the doctrine of the visibility of the Church; of the apostolical succession in the ministry; of the authority of the Church in matters of faith; of the things signified in the sacraments.”—(p. 28.)

“Does it seem a startling assertion that the doctrines of Catholic consent, of grace in the sacraments, of succession in the ministry, of visibility in the Church, are the natural and effective complement, and the best guarantee of those doctrines of personal religion, for the lively and general exhibition of which we owe so much to the Romaines, the Newtons, the Scotts,” &c.—(p. 471.)

We learn, then, from Mr. Gladstone, that the doctrines which it is now the fashion to speak of as being more especially ‘Church Principles,’ may be naturally arranged under these four heads:—

1. The Visibility of the Church;
2. The Authority of the Church;
3. Apostolic Succession; and
4. Grace in the Sacraments.

And, as we feel, at once, the extent of the subject, and the difficulty presented by our narrow limits, we shall without preface address ourselves to the double inquiry, What is meant by these principles; and, whether they be, indeed, principles recognized by the Church?

1. *The Visibility of the Church.* At the first glance, a casual reader might be disposed to ask, what dispute could possibly arise

about this point? Every one, surely,—he might say,—admitted that there was a visible Church of Christ among us!

Unquestionably,—but *this* is not the drift of Mr. Gladstone's argument. The point he endeavours to establish is not the existence of a visible Church, locally situated in this land, and claiming, as the Church of *England*, the allegiance of the people;—but something far higher and more imposing. "The Scriptures," he tells us, "hold out to our view the *actual historical Church* as the great object of the love and regard of Christ," "and as intended to have unity in the body and the spirit, with *universality, authority, visibility, permanency*, sympathy:—as the casket and treasure-house of God's immortal gifts: as destined to a present warfare, and a final glorification." (p. 116.) "The Church which inherits the promises of Christ, and which is *declared by Scripture to be His body*, is ONE, and is VISIBLE." (p. 109.) "There is, in the catholic idea of the Church, provision made for superseding the idea of self as a centre of motion, and the idea of self-interest as an end, by giving to us Christian privileges, not in our capacity of individuals, but as component portions of that great frame of which the glorified Redeemer is the living and sympathizing Head." Thus we see that the point at which Mr. Gladstone labours, is to establish *the Visibility of the Catholic Church*;—of that Church which is described in Scripture as 'the spouse' of Christ; 'the bride;' 'the Lamb's wife.' All these, and many other beautiful figures in Scripture, which represent to us 'a holy nation,' a 'peculiar people,' 'the ransomed of the Lord,' &c., are descriptive, in Mr. Gladstone's view, of that vast mass of practical heathenism and idolatry, called 'Christendom;'—in short, of the aggregate of all the baptized persons in all the countries called Christian!

An hypothesis so startling as this, ought surely to have been proved from Scripture, and from the standards of the Church. But Mr. Gladstone prefers the easier course, of throwing the onus of proof on those who refuse to admit his theory. He says:—

"We may challenge the proof from Scripture of any plurality of Churches, except such as is local only; of any such division as that of a present visible and a present invisible Church, differing in essence, the latter only possessing gifts, and the former but types and shadows of gifts."—(p. 112.)

This is not a legitimate course of proceeding. Mr. Gladstone should make out his own case, before he 'challenges' a reply. And his challenge should be more accurately worded. We speak of no 'plurality of churches' *except* 'such as is local.' But we may say that, as it has ever been, from the foundation of the world, so is it now,—that there is an external or visible church, including a multitude of mere professors; and within this large enclosure there is

found a smaller and an invisible fence, which includes the true or spiritual church, the sheep, and which does not include the goats. "*They are not all Israel which are of Israel; neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children.*" "*For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh, but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.*"

Mr. Gladstone, when he "challenges proof" of an invisible Church, can scarcely have forgotten such texts as these. "*My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish; neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.*" "*Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate,—and whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.*" "*The general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven.*" Yet which of these, and of a multitude of similar passages, will consist with Mr. Gladstone's theory, of 'that body of which Christ is the Head,' being 'Visible?'

But again we would ask Mr. Gladstone to make out his own case. The Church Catholic; now visible in the world:—this is what he calls a "magnificent conception of a power incorporated on earth." (p. 116.) All we ask, is, where the reality of this magnificent conception is to be met with? It is said to be 'visible.' We ask to see it.

But we can neither discover it in the world around us; nor in the Scriptures; nor in the standards of the English Church. Nor does Mr. Gladstone give us the least aid in searching for it in either direction. The Church of Christ, the Catholic Church, now visible among men. 'It is *one*, and it is *visible*,' says Mr. Gladstone. Where, then, shall we find it?

To call the English Establishment 'the Catholic Church' is an extravagance of which Mr. Gladstone would not wish to be guilty. To combine with it, all or most of the other Protestant Churches, is clearly not his view; since it is tolerably evident that he entertains doubts of the genuineness of the Christianity of some of those communities. And a combination of the true faith with the apostacy,—of the bride of the Lamb with the harlot-rider on the ten-horned beast, is distinctly negatived by one of his own canons. "To constitute unity of body there must be some unity of law and of action; but this cannot exist where not only there is *no unity of action*, but no provision for it, and where the vital principles of the one part are not only not found, but *blasphemed* in the other part,

so that *if the one be life the other must be death.*" (p. 111.) Mr. Gladstone is well aware that he himself, and every sincere member of the Church of England, is now lying under the ban of more than fifty anathemas, solemnly levelled against all followers of the truth of the gospel, by the last General Council of the Church of Rome. "If the one be life, the other must be death." There can be no unity here. Then where is this Visible Church of Christ on earth, gifted "with *universality, authority, visibility, permanency?*" It has no existence. It is a dream.

But if not visible in the world at large, it is discernible in Scripture? This should have been Mr. Gladstone's main inquiry. If this one point could have been made satisfactorily out, the 'principle' would have been established.

Here, however, instead of the strongest, we find the weakest part of Mr. Gladstone's argument. He had to prove from Scripture, that it was the will of God that One Visible Catholic Church should subsist throughout all ages, "invested with privilege and authority," and "having the stewardship of God's word and the ordinances of his grace." The fulfilment of this Divine decree being by no means apparent in ecclesiastical history, it was the more incumbent on him to establish the reality of such a decree, from Scripture, in so indubitable a manner as to leave no room for question or cavil. But we look in vain for any such proof. Vagueness and irrelevance pervade the whole of Mr. Gladstone's proofs from Scripture. He quotes our Lord's frequent expression "the kingdom of heaven:" he quotes the opening address of the Lord's Prayer, "Our Father:" he quotes also a number of passages from the writings of the apostles, expressive of the certainty and perpetuity of the faith of the elect; and describing the blessed standing of the true Church. But as to the mode, by which these descriptions can be safely applied to the millions of ungodly and unbelieving who are Christians in name and nothing else, we have not one word. All is assumption, from first to last. A notable example of this is seen in the unhesitating application of the description of "the bride, the Lamb's wife," (Rev. xxi.) to the "One Visible Church,"—to the "actual historical Church," now and for the last eighteen centuries extant upon earth. Whereas, if Mr. Gladstone, after reading verse 9 of chap. xxi. had but read the 10th also, he would have seen that "the bride, the Lamb's wife," was shewn to the prophet as "*descending out of heaven from God,*"—*after*, and not until, Babylon, and the false prophet, and the "woman," or apostate church, "drunken with the blood of the saints," had all been swept away. Then, and only then, will the "*woman clothed with the sun, and having the moon under her*

feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars," return from the wilderness into which she has been driven.

The whole tenor of the fore-view given alike by St. Paul and St. John, shews us the true church driven into obscurity, and an usurper occupying its place. "*He, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.*" In this plain fact, all the great commentators on Scripture agree. Yet Mr. Gladstone wholly evades it, and clings to his idea, altogether destitute, as it is, of Scriptural authority,—that the Church of God, the Catholic Church, 'is One, and is Visible.'

His proofs from the standards of the Church are still more meagre;—or rather, there are none at all! Yet this, in a work professing to expound "*Church Principles*" is somewhat strange. It is easily accounted for, however, so soon as we open the Articles of the Church, and enquire what is their language, touching this 'One Visible Church,' 'the spouse of Christ,' 'the body of which He is the head.'

"The visible Church of Christ," says the sixth Article, "is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

"As the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith."

Here we have not one word of 'universality, authority, permanency;' but on the other hand, we have the clearest possible assertion of *locality*, and of *errability*. In what way Mr. Gladstone proposes to reconcile these two contrarieties, we know not. To our minds, his theory, and the sixth Article, are diametrically opposed to each other. And so much for the first of the four dogmas which Mr. Gladstone dignifies with the name of 'Church Principles.'

But in pursuing Mr. Gladstone's train of reasoning, we soon find out *why it is* that he is so anxious to establish his foundation-principle of the *Visibility* of the *Catholic Church*. For, on proceeding to the next point,

2. *The authority of the Church*: we find Mr. Gladstone thus enforcing it:

"The Church of England holds individual freedom in things spiritual to be an essential attribute of man's true nature, and an essential condition of the right reception of the Gospel; and testifies to that sentiment in the most emphatic mode, by encouraging the fullest communication of Scripture to the people. Yet is it perfectly possible that the best use of such a freedom may often be thus exemplified: when a man, having prayed for light from God,

and having striven to live in the spirit of his prayer, and yet finding his own opinion upon a point of doctrine opposite to that of the universal undivided Church, recognises the answer to his prayer and the guide to his mind in the declarations of the creeds rather than in his own single and perhaps recent impressions upon the subject, not thus surrendering his own liberty of judgment, but using it in order to weigh and compare the probabilities of his or the Church's correctness respectively, and acting faithfully on the result."—(pp. 155, 156.)

Here we at once see the *use* which is intended to be made, of the assumed fact, of the existence of a Visible, Catholic Church. It overbears the judgment and conscience of the individual. Such an individual is supposed by Mr. Gladstone to have prayed for Divine direction, and still to find his own view of the sense of the word of God on some doctrine, "opposite to that of the *universal undivided church*." Very naturally, therefore, Mr. Gladstone supposes him to give way, and to surrender his own conscientious convictions to his sense of "the probabilities of the Church's correctness."

Surely Mr. Gladstone cannot avoid seeing that in this, his own supposition, the teaching of 'the Church' supersedes and overrules the teaching of the word of God. The man has asked for Divine direction, and, reading his Bible, he finds a certain doctrine there. Aye, but—says Mr. Gladstone—"the universal undivided church" is of another opinion, and it is 'more probable' that you have mistaken the sense of Scripture, than that the Catholic Church can have erred.

So argues every Papist in Christendom; and so argues Mr. Gladstone. Without stopping to question their conclusion, we utterly deny their premises. This supposed "universal undivided Church" is a mere fiction. It has no existence; it never had any; and it never will have any; until "*the tabernacle of God shall be with men; and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people.*"

But we must hasten to a close. There remain

The Succession; and the Grace of the Sacraments. On these two closely-connected subjects, Mr. Gladstone thus writes,—

"The holiest exhortations, so Scripture teaches, could not avail, but for the parallel and hidden movements of that grace which in Christianity makes religion a power instead of a form. One may say to a man, and say truly, 'You are God's creature, you *ought* to serve your Creator.' But that word 'ought,' which carries with it, in the mind of a deeply-penitent man, a resistless energy, has no stringency to our natural perceptions: perhaps even the naked proposition might be denied—at all events its results would be evaded. We have not, therefore, yet arrived at the means by which a spiritual life is actually brought home to the heart of man. It is not the sound doctrine, nor even the presenting of that wholesome food to the heart as a seed is laid in the ground, nor the appreciation of the stimulants of fear, and hope, and unappreciable love. There is still wanting a mystical and

secret link between the knowledge implanted, in which its spiritual uses lie locked as in a kernel, and the character of the man: that connection, that capacity of intercommunication, between the heart of the man who is to be known—that power of extracting the nutriment on the one side, which seconds and meets the capacity of yielding it on the other, must be supplied by the inscrutable agency of divine grace.

“This gem, destined for an earthly use, requires a casket—this casket a keeper. The casket is found in the Holy Sacraments; the keeper in their appointed, hereditary, and perpetual guardians.”—(p. 278.)

“The Sacraments are the peculiar and distinctive instruments, whereby men receive those essential elements which constitute their unity in Christ.”—(p. 170.)

“Undoubtedly we should reckon as the highest and main use of Sacraments their office of specially and peculiarly imparting to us the participation of the Divine nature.”—(p. 176.)

“That indescribable, transcendent energy which is the virtue and life of preaching, and the rest of the functions of the Church, is yet more and far more remarkably illustrated by the manner in which it is known to be and to work in the Sacraments.”—(p. 178.)

“If we compare the Sacraments with the preaching of the word, the blessing which belongs thereto is, as a general rule, both *inferior* and more indeterminate: for the word so preached is mingled with human imperfection; whereas, that which is received in the Sacrament is wholly Divine; and the reasonable assumption that the blessing is realized, is more nearly positive in the act of communicating than hearing, which is almost entirely passive.”—(p. 171.)

Now this distorted representation of the respective power and value of the Sacraments, and the Preaching of the Word, is, like Mr. Gladstone's first principle, neither supported by fact, by Scripture, nor by the Church.

Not by *fact*: for we can point to thousands and tens of thousands, who, by the simple preaching of the word, have been “*brought from darkness into light, and from the power of Satan unto God*,” and this, after both the Sacraments had been duly administered by priests of the Apostolical Succession, without the least result of any beneficial kind. But we may call in vain for the like number, or for *any* number of similar cases, of wicked men made holy, either by the reception of Baptism or by the Lord's Supper. In fact, the Church constantly reminds us that a Sacrament can only be beneficial when received in *faith*. But he that hath faith, thus declared to be essential to a right reception, hath already that which is the substance of his salvation.

Scripture presents an entirely opposite view to that of Mr. Gladstone. The *great work*, in the apostles' view, was the preaching of the gospel. When this was made efficient by the power of the Holy Ghost, and men were actually converted, and brought into a state of salvation,—*then*, and often by some secondary agent, or assistant minister, the rite which admitted them into the visible Church was administered. Thus Peter preaches Christ to Cornelius and his guests, and while they gladly

received the word, the Holy Ghost, in all His divine power, fell upon them. *After which*, the apostle—not baptized them,—but “*commanded them to be baptized.*” In like manner Paul thanks God that he “*baptized none but Crispus and Gaius;*” adding, “*for Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel,*” But of this latter grand business of his life, he says, “*a necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is me if I preach not the gospel.*” And when he instructs his successors at Ephesus and Crete, he lays upon Timothy, with the greatest possible solemnity, this main injunction, “**PREACH THE WORD; be instant in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine.**” And to Titus he declares that “*God hath manifested his word THROUGH PREACHING.*” And instead of instructing them that the blessing which accompanies the preaching of the word is ‘inferior’ to that attached to the Sacraments, he actually concludes his instructions to both his successors, without so much as mentioning *either* of these ordinances!

And *the Church* follows the footsteps of the apostles in this particular. Perpetually she places the ‘preaching of the pure word of God’ in the very first rank; and never is it represented as ‘inferior’ to the Sacraments. In fact, on a review of the whole subject, we have been much struck with the manner and the degree, in which Mr. Gladstone, professing to enunciate and explain ‘Church Principles,’ does, in truth, assert dogmas which are clearly beyond and *extra*, the declarations of the Church. She knows nothing of the Visibility of the Catholic Church;—she defines the right of conferring orders to be in those ‘who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard;’—meaning thereby *not* absolutely to exclude from the list of Visible Churches, those who had not episcopal ordination. The Authority of the Church she subordinates to the decisions of the written word; instead of making the decisions of the Church affix a meaning to the Divine oracles. And the grace of the Sacraments she expressly limits to those who come to them in faith. In every one of these points, then, Mr. Gladstone goes *beyond* the Church, and the more correct title to his work would be, ‘*Ultra-Church Principles* maintained and illustrated.’

At the same time we are bound to yield the highest meed of praise to the tone and manner in which his volume is conceived and written. There is no controversial work in the English language which exceeds it—few indeed that may compare with it—either for an uniform kindness and gentleness of spirit, or for a devout and truly religious tone of mind. To be a model of

theological discussion it wants but two things,—a greater clearness of definition, and a larger infusion of the words and the sense of Scripture. The main fault, however, is, that it strives to render decent and attractive, an essentially erroneous and dangerous system. With sympathetic, gentle, but weak and ill-informed minds, it will doubtless do some harm. But among men accustomed to reason, and especially to base all their views upon Scripture itself, its influence will neither be deep nor lasting.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY; *from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire.* By the Rev. H. H. MILMAN; Prebendary of St. Peter's, and Minister of St. Margaret's, Westminster. Three vols. 8vo. *Murray.*

THIS work has now been published, we believe, some eight or nine months; and is therefore already losing the character of a new work. It has also been extensively noticed in various periodicals; and its character, we should apprehend, is becoming tolerably well understood. Still, however, we have been made aware, in various ways, that to a considerable proportion of the reading public, the warnings already given have not yet reached, and that men are frequently purchasing the book, merely because it is a "History of Christianity," by a man of acknowledged talent and learning, and a Prebendary of Westminster. We must therefore add our voice to the, we believe, almost unanimous verdict, which designates Mr. Milman a public offender;—we must do what in us lies, to hinder the circulation of a most pernicious work.

This book is one which ought to be excluded from every Christian's library, inasmuch as it does not deal with the Bible as with the WORD OF GOD; but treats it, after the example of the German neologians, as little more than an old history, possessed of a certain degree of authenticity and authority; but by no means entitled to implicit credit: And further, its general tendency is, to bestow praise and approbation on the heathen, the rationalist, and the mere philosopher; while it, in most cases, depreciates the character of the firm and constant believer in the gospel.

These are grave and fearful accusations; and we must at once proceed to make them good. Here are a few instances:—

"The place was called Beth-esda (the house of mercy), and the pool was

supposed to possess remarkable properties for healing diseases. At certain periods there was a strong commotion in the waters, which probably bubbled up from some chemical cause connected with their medicinal effects. *Popular belief, or rather perhaps popular language*, attributed this agitation of the surface to the descent of an angel, for of course the regular descent of a celestial being, visible to the whole city, cannot for an instant be supposed."—(vol. i. p. 215.)

"Yet concealment, or at least less frequent publicity, seems now to have been his object, for when some of those insane persons, *the dæmoniacs as they were called*, openly address him by the title of Son of God, Jesus enjoins their silence, as though he were yet unwilling openly to assume this title, which was fully equivalent to that of the Messiah; and which, no doubt, was already ascribed to him by the bolder and less prudent of his followers."—(vol. i. p. 224.)

"The present case, indeed, seems to have been one rather of infirmity than lunacy: the afflicted person was blind and dumb; but such cases were equally ascribed to malignant spirits. There is one very strong reason, which I do not remember to have seen urged with sufficient force, but which may have contributed to induce Jesus *to adopt the current language*, on this point. The disbelief in these spiritual influences was one of the characteristic tenets of the unpopular sect of the sadducees. A departure from the common language, or the endeavour to correct this *inveterate error*, would have raised an immediate outcry against him from his watchful and malignant adversaries, as an unbelieving sadducee."—(vol. i. p. 234.)

"The moral difficulty of this transaction has always appeared to me greater than that of reconciling it with the more rational view of dæmoniacism. Both are much diminished, if not entirely removed, by the theory of Kuinoel, who attributes to the lunatics the whole of the conversation with Jesus, and supposes that their driving the herd of swine down the precipice was the last paroxysm in which their insanity exhausted itself."—(vol. i. p. 238.)

"The height on which they stood, their own half-waking state, the sounds from heaven (whether articulate voices or thunder, which *appeared* to give the divine assent to their own preconceived notions of the Messiah), the wonderful change in the appearance of Jesus, the glittering cloud which seemed to absorb the two spirits, and leave Jesus alone upon the mountain; all the incidents of this majestic and mysterious scene, whether presented as *dreams before their sleeping*, or as visions before their waking senses, tended to elevate still higher their already exalted notions of their Master."—(vol. i. p. 258.)

"As he was yet speaking, a *rolling sound* was heard in the heavens, which the unbelieving part of the multitude heard only as an accidental burst of thunder: to others, however, it *seemed* an audible, a distinct, or, according to those who adhere to the strict letter, the articulate voice of an angel, proclaiming the divine sanction to the presage of his future glory."—(vol. i. p. 306-7.)

"The next instant, however, the momentary weakness is subdued, and though the agony is so severe that the sweat falls *like* large drops of blood to the ground, resigns himself at once to the will of God. Nothing can heighten the terrors of the coming scene so much as its effect, in anticipation, on the mind of Jesus himself."—(vol. i. p. 332.)

The other, of milder disposition, yet in death, inclines to believe in Jesus, and when he returns to assume his kingdom would hope to share in its blessings. To him Jesus, *speaking in the current language*, promises an immediate reward; he is to pass at once from life to happiness."—(vol. i. p. 361.)

Surely we have already quoted enough to shew that Mr. Milman does not deal with the Bible as with a Revelation from God; and therefore claiming a simple and perfect submission of mind; but

as with a mere human history, which he means to contend for as generally true; but the errors and incredible passages of which it is his business to explain or surrender, as reasonably and as plausibly as he can!

On our second topic of complaint, let the reader contrast the following sketch of the character of Julian, with that of the Christian bishop whom he persecuted:—

“ Julian has, perhaps, been somewhat unfairly branded with the ill-sounding name of apostate.

“ During the two unfinished years of his sole government, Julian had reunited the whole Roman empire under his single sceptre; he had reformed the army, the court, the tribunals of justice; he had promulgated many useful laws, which maintained their place in the jurisprudence of the empire; he had established peace on all the frontiers; he had organised a large and well-disciplined force to chastise the Persians for their aggressions on the eastern border, and, by a formidable diversion within their own territories, to secure the Euphratic provinces against the most dangerous rival of the Roman power. During all these engrossing cares of empire, he devoted himself with the zeal and activity of a mere philosopher and a man of letters to more tranquil pursuits.

“ The genius of ancient Rome and of ancient Greece might appear to revive in amicable union in the soul of Julian. The unmeasured military ambition, which turned the defensive into a war of aggression on all the imperilled frontiers; the broad and vigorous legislation; the unity of administration; the severer tone of manners, which belonged to the better days of Rome; the fine cultivation; the perspicuous philosophy; the lofty conceptions of moral greatness and purity, which distinguished the old Athenian.”—(vol. iii. pp. 49, 50.)

Now read his estimate of the mind of Athanasius:—

“ During two reigns, Athanasius contested the authority of the emperor. He endured persecution, calumny, exile: his life was frequently endangered in defence of *one single tenet*; and that, it may be permitted to say, the most purely intellectual, and apparently the most remote from the ordinary passions of man. He confronted martyrdom, not for the broad and palpable distinction between Christianity and heathenism, but for *fine and subtle expressions* of the Christian creed.”—(vol. ii. p. 450.)

“ It is impossible, indeed, not to admire the force of intellect which he centered on this *minute point* of theology; his intrepidity, his constancy; but had he not the power to allay the feud which his inexorable spirit tended to keep alive? Was the term ‘Consubstantialism’ absolutely essential to Christianity? If a somewhat wider creed had been accepted, would not the truth at least as soon and as generally have prevailed? Could not the commanding or persuasive voice of Christianity have awed or charmed the troubled waters to peace?”—(vol. iii. p. 8.)

“ Though nothing can contrast more strongly with the expansive and liberal spirit of primitive Christianity than the repulsive tone of this *exclusive theology*, yet this remarkable phasis of Christianity seems to have been necessary, and not without advantage to the permanence of the religion.”—(vol. iii. p. 39.)

Is it possible to avoid seeing, that the admiration of the prebendary of Westminster is given to the heathen persecutor; and that he can only coldly wonder at the obstinacy of Athanasius, in per-

sisting in "one single tenet," "one minute point;"—that *minute* point being *only*,—whether his Lord and Saviour were really God,—were really able to accomplish the salvation of his church,—or merely a creature, and consequently incompetent to the work he had undertaken!

Of a work, professedly religious, but which deals with sacred things in such a spirit, we can only say, that we would not willingly suffer such an one to be found in our library.

UNITARIANISM CONFUTED: *a Series of Lectures delivered in Christ Church, Liverpool, in 1839.* By THIRTEEN CLERGYMEN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Liverpool: *Perris*. 1839.

A COPY of the above volume has been sent to us, and it almost forces us to regret that we are not a year older. It is not a work of the year which is now closing, therefore can scarcely come under our notice. We mention it, however, in passing, as the joint production of the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, the Rev. J. H. Stewart, the Rev. W. Dalton, the Rev. Hugh Stowell, the Rev. R. P. Buddicom, and several other clergymen of the highest character in Liverpool and its vicinity. A review of a volume of sermons must, in order to be effective, occupy considerable space. On the present occasion, however, we have no liberty even to attempt it. We merely name the work, as one which any reader who is desirous of mastering the Unitarian controversy would do well to purchase.

SEVEN SERMONS *on the Sacrament of Baptism, the Rite of Confirmation, and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.* By WILLIAM WILSON, B.D., Vicar of Walthamstow. 1840.

THIS is an useful little volume, explaining both to the young and to parents the real nature of the Sacrament of Baptism, the Office and Duties of Sponsors, the Uses of Confirmation, and the true character of the Lord's Supper. Among many misleading guides, we gladly point to Mr. Wilson as one whose instructions may safely and beneficially be followed.

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

FEBRUARY, 1841.

CHRISTIAN MORALS. By the Rev. WILLIAM SEWELL, M.A.
Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, and Professor of Moral
Philosophy in the University of Oxford. London: *Burns*. 1840.

SOME works claim attention from their intrinsic merits: others from important principles evolved, or from adventitious circumstances of influence with which they are connected. On all these grounds Professor Sewell's book has a high claim to our consideration—as the production of a powerful and original mind—as impregnated with great principles—but specially as an elaborate application of the Tractarian system to the weighty subject of 'Christian Morals.'

A treatise on this subject, soundly based on Scriptural ground, would indeed be a most valuable desideratum. That the Professor's work answers to this character we dare not affirm. On the contrary, we have risen from its careful perusal with a painful but decided conviction of the unsoundness of its main dogmas, whether as tested by Holy Writ or by the standards of his own Church.

We have assumed that 'Christian Morals' must be grounded upon Scripture, simply because it was "given by inspiration of God," for the express purpose, "*that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*"* Here then manifestly is our code of morals. We may, with our Author, illustrate *points of detail* from heathen systems. But *the principles* must be drawn exclusively from the Word of God. Nor would we content ourselves with a naked statement of *these prin-*

* 2 Timothy iii. 16, 17.

ciples, leaving them to work by their innate force, without direct inculcation, or committing them to the caprice or excitement of feeling. We would, after the Apostolic pattern, domesticate—so to speak—the sacred book; making it the spring of every social relation—the directory of every individual part of conduct or of difficulty. Thus should we stamp the impress of the Gospel upon the heart, and express every feature and lineament of the new man in the Christian profession.

But here lies our essential difference with the Professor. *His system is based mainly on the Church, rather than on the Scriptures.* This is a grave charge. Let the accused speak for himself. After having alluded to a body of men, *fifteen hundred years ago*, whom our Author characterises as the chief benefactors of our race, he adds—

“It is *their testimony*, to which, in the present day, we must look back through the long mist of years, whenever we want to know what is good and evil—what will make us happy—how we should try to become, what we all wish to become, perfect instead of imperfect, strong instead of weak, pure instead of impure, wise instead of fools.”—(pp. 15, 16.) Compare also p. 127.

We might ask, were not the Holy Scriptures written for these ends? * Yet have we here the *Nicene—not the Apostolic*—Church, taking their place as the standard of faith, and the directory of conduct. The teaching of the Church is substituted for God’s own test—“*To the law and to the testimony.*” † Divine truth is to be seen, not through the pure glass of Scripture, but through the darkened mirror of Nicene superstition. Notwithstanding occasional allusion to the right standard, ‡ “the necessity of reference to the Church as *the primary authority in morals*,” is insisted on. § She is considered the only medium of communication with the Apostles, || although we have their *written testimony* in its original purity; a far more trustworthy authority than *their oral testimony*, which we know to have been extensively corrupted in the first stage of transmission. ¶ To attain the knowledge of God, a creed, not the Bible, is necessary; although our Church values the creeds, only so far as they can be proved by Holy Scripture. ** *Not the Bible*, but the liturgies and formularies of the Church, are the touchstone of Scriptural doctrine. †† Generally speaking, “belief is a virtue, and doubt is a sin.” ‡‡ The testimony of the Church is therefore to be received with implicit faith. To receive it not on its own voice—but upon its internal evidence, is a sinful infirmity. §§—But let this suffice. Let our readers determine, whether these are the

* John xx. 31. Rom. xv. 4.

† Isaiah viii. 20.

‡ P. 42.

§ Ib. 198.

|| Ib. 37, 198, 380.

¶ See the Colossian and Apocalyptic Churches. Compare 2 Thess. ii. 7.

** P. 304, with Art. viii.

†† Ib. 117.

‡‡ Ib. 11.

§§ Ib. 62.

principles and component parts of a system based solely and simply upon the Word of God. The Scripture is tested by the Church—not the Church by the Scripture. There is a grievous neglect of that “philosophy,” which—as Melancthon insisted in his disputation with Eck—“is enjoined us with respect to the Scriptures of God”—namely—“to bring to them all the thoughts and maxims of men, as to the touchstone, by which they are to be tried.”

Another fundamental objection to our Professor's theory is, *that it is grounded upon the ordinances, rather than upon the doctrines of the Gospel.* True, indeed, the sacramental ordinances are figurative representations of the doctrines. But it is too evident, that, with this school, the form of the sacraments—not the life-giving doctrines—constitutes their efficacy. Our Author gives some valuable observations upon the usefulness of forms, their just place in the system, and the evil and danger of *depreciating* them.* But not less dangerous—as the Professor himself admits—is their undue exaltation, of which his own system presents the strongest evidence. For example: on the subject of infant education we are gravely told—“Before any thing can be done, or hoped, *a ceremony must be performed over the child.*”—(p. 129.)

Again—“The Church performs a *simple ceremony.* It tells us that, under the veil of this outward rite, a great inward work has been accomplished.”—(p. 214.)

So again, currency is given to the idea of the expulsion of the evil spirit in “infant baptism, *by the exorcisms and sufflations of the clergy.*”† Indeed our Author conceives, that “it would be better for us, if we were more superstitious than we are;” simply “because superstition is better than indifference.” But is it necessary to fall into one evil, in order to avoid another? Surely the Scriptural path is equally removed from both—“God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him *in spirit and in truth.*”‡

But let us hear the Professor's views concerning the high value of the sacraments:—

“The Church educates not merely by words, by advice, and instruction; but mainly and chiefly by communicating to you certain spiritual gifts of immeasurable value, ‘unseen, but not unfelt.’ *And these it professes to communicate through the means of certain outward acts and symbols. Its great instruments of good are the sacraments.*”—(pp. 144, 145.)

Next—their important connection with “Christian Morals:”—

* Chapter xi.

† P. 147. We conceive our Author to be most inaccurate in adducing the miraculous exorcisms of our Lord and his Apostles as a precedent for the ordinary dispensations of the Church. We need scarcely add, that in the origin there was no connection whatever with baptism.

‡ John iv. 24.

“As it was before said, that the foundation of Christian ethics must be laid in the sacrament of baptism, and the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; so let it now be asserted, that *the whole superstructure rests on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, and the real, spiritual, personal presence and communication of the blessed body of our Lord to those who rightly partake in it.” (p. 392.)

Now if this be correct, we cannot but remark, that the instructions of our Divine Master were essentially defective. No such prominence is given to the sacraments even in His later, more enlarged, and confidential ministry, to His disciples. He spoke indeed of higher privileges about to be conferred upon His Church. But these were connected with the plenary effusion of the Spirit, *not with the anticipated institution of the sacraments.** “Christian Morals”—in other words, Christian holiness—He traces not to sacramental grace, but to a vital union with Himself by faith.† Or turning to the more full page of Apostolic instruction, we shall find that whole Epistles (e. g. to the Thessalonians) were written to the Churches, inculcating Christian Morals by the practical application of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, with no allusion whatever to sacramental life.‡ The Apostle subordinates one sacrament manifestly to the preaching of the Gospel.§ To the other (which the Professor—as we have seen—regards as the basis of the whole superstructure) only a single distinct allusion is made; and *that*—not as laying down ethical principles, but as correcting Church abuses.|| No express injunctions are given to the two Presbyters respecting them in the ministerial Epistles.

Then as to the effects to be wrought under the New Testament administration. We cannot doubt that the oral preaching of the Gospel—*not the sacraments*—was the grand lever of Divine instrumentality.¶ This—not the sacraments—was the *primary* commission delegated to the Great Apostle.** This was the means of the conversion of the Churches,†† mainly also of their subsequent establishment in the faith.‡‡ This, in individual cases, is found still to be the ordinary, though not the exclusive, means of imparting, not only the first germ of the spiritual life, but the daily sustenance and continual growth of the new man.§§ We highly honour these holy ordinances as valuable means of grace. We only protest against the claims of exclusiveness now set up for them. We contend, that the attempt now making to build up our

* John xiv. 12, 20; xvi. 12, 13, with Luke xxiv. 49.

† Ib. xv. 1—8.

‡ Mark the force of the illative particle, Ephesians iv. 1, connected with the three first chapters of the Epistle.

§ 1 Cor. i. 17.

|| Ib. xi. 20—23.

¶ 1 Cor. i. 21; iv. 14. James i. 18.

** Acts xxvi. 16—18.

†† Ib. xiii. 48; xiv. 3; xvii. 1—4, with 1 Thess. i. 5; ii. 13.

‡‡ Ib. xiv. 21, 22; xv. 36—41. 1 Thess. iii. 2, 10. We do not find our Lord alluding to the sacraments, as the means of reviving the decayed Apocalyptic Churches.

§§ 1 Peter i. 23; ii. 2.

Church upon sacramental foundations is traducing her real character and Scriptural ground, by exhibiting her teaching and administration as formed on a basis so dissimilar from the Apostolic model.*

Professor Sewell's views of the sacraments severally are of course in consistency with the high elevation given to the whole economy. Baptism, in our Author's perception, is all that the infant needs to cleanse from his original taint, and to perfect his acceptance with God.

"It restores the mind to the consciousness of purity, enables it to look up even to God himself with an open uncowering eye; and to take its stand as a cleansed and holy thing, to enter fearlessly and proudly on the battle against the world, the flesh, and the devil."—(p. 217.)

In other places it is set forth as the only agency employed in the new creation of God.—(pp. 218, 266, 323.)

Now we fully admit, that baptism, according to the definition of a sacrament, is *a means* of working this wondrous change, with all its attendant blessings. But here lies our important difference with the Professor. He believes this grace to be inseparable from the performance of the ceremony, and therefore equally effectual, when the ordinance is profaned as when it is revered—when unworthily as when rightly received. Either in a false and unscriptural charity he must deny the former hypothesis; or he claims for the sacrament the Popish charm of the *opus operatum*. We conceive baptism to be a Christian ordinance for Christian people (and for whom else could it be acceptably appointed?), wherein the true child of Abraham takes the seal, and confirms to himself and his child the blessings of the covenant, and thanks God, *as in duty bound to do*, for the privileges here visibly sealed. For whether or not they be actually bestowed at the moment (and who knows that they are not?), yet, as being confirmed by God's seal for his own best time of their vouchsafement, they are just matter of *present* and grateful acknowledgment.

Our Author insists upon a distinction, not always wrought out with theological accuracy, between *desire and possession*, to prove the baptismal standing to be actual *possession*.† For ourselves we see no necessary opposition. The seal makes over to the Christian *virtual possession*. At the same time can he restrain intense *desire* for the manifestation? But to expound *his exclu-*

* Dr. Pusey affirms, that our Church nowhere teaches us to "look for a full remission of sins, *except through baptism*."—Remonstrance to the Author of the Pastoral Letter, p. 38. We need only refer him to the Collect for Ash Wednesday, and the sacramental absolution, where he will find this blessing connected with sincere and penitential confession.

† Chapters xv.—xvii.

sive privileges as the possession of every baptised professor, and to link them with what we fear is too often the case—the bare performance of the naked ceremony—is, in our view, a most gross confusion of ideas, and a most dangerous perversion of the sacred ordinance. It might seem not unreasonable to ask for palpable and extended proof of this universal efficacy. The Professor, while he rebukes our unbelief,* condescends to our infirmity; though from his misapprehension of the ground of our incredulity (not to say from the nature of the case) his attempt at evidence is most unsatisfactory.† We doubt—not because of *man's weakness and unworthiness*‡ (which, a priori, would be in analogy with the Divine dispensation§), *but because of man's ignorance, self-righteousness, and carelessness*; and because of the established rule in *express reference* to holy ordinances—“*Them that honour me I will honour; and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.*” ||

While on this subject, we cannot forbear the remark, how defective and erroneous views on particular points of the Gospel shed confusion over the whole system. “Baptism is” indeed, as the Professor observes, “a covenant;”¶ or, to speak more accurately, the seal of a covenant. But had he clearly understood the nature and provisions of the baptismal or Christian covenant, he would have seen, that it involved no such revolting hypothesis as “erecting man into an independent deity, in some sense superior to his Maker, and governing the actions of his Maker—placing at his disposal the counsels and the works of God himself.”—(p. 269.)

The One Mediator undertakes for both parties. The obligations are made the subject of promise. Obedience is secured by the law written in the heart. Perseverance is established—not in presumption, indolence, or sin—but in watchfulness, humility, prayer, and in every exercise of practical godliness.** God works not without us, or we without Him. But he “works in”—through—by—“us, to will and to do of his own good pleasure.”††

It is curious also to observe the crude inferences with which this system is necessarily entangled. Baptism being with our Author the *exclusive* means of regeneration,‡‡ he can only account for the goodness of Abraham, David, and Socrates (an association in the mouth of an objector, but virtually allowed by the Professor), by Plato's hypothesis, that they were “*creatures of circumstance.*”§§ We should naturally, after our Lord's example, have traced a good act to a good principle.|||| At all events, when so much virtue is

* P. 239.

† Pp. 241—243.

‡ Ib. 239.

§ 1 Cor. i. 26—29. 2 Cor. iv. 7; xii. 9.

|| 1 Sam. ii. 30.

¶ Chap. xx.

** Jer. xxxi. 31—34; xxxii. 40.

†† Phil. ii. 12, 13.

‡‡ Pp. 210, 218, 266.

§§ Pp. 276, 277.

|||| Matthew vii. 20; xii. 33.

ascribed to sacramental agency, we should have thought that the sacrament of circumcision—the *correlative to baptism*—would have placed “the father of the faithful,” and “the man after God’s own heart,” in some higher level than the heathen philosopher. Nor could we have presumed to call in the verdict of another heathen sage, to determine the state of men so manifestly in perfect acceptance with God. But when the plain Scripture track is forsaken, human learning offers no preservative against the grossest hallucinations.

We naturally anticipated the Professor’s supreme exaltation of the Eucharist. But we confess we were little prepared for a grave defence of the primitive absurdity of the infant administration. The new-born babe, quickened by baptism, requires sustenance. The Eucharist is the only food known or thought of. “Unseen,” therefore, “unexplained, uncomprehended, he takes from the hand of those whom God has set to guard him, the mysterious symbols and vehicles, in which the vital sustenance is embodied.”—(p. 391.)

Did our Author never conceive, that this ceremony might possibly minister poison rather than life? Or was the proxy of the faith of the Church (of which, however, no intimation is given) to interpose between the unconscious subject and the tremendous consequence of “not discerning the Lord’s body?”* And yet this administration is seriously recommended, without one atom of scriptural proof or evidence; yes, and substituted throughout the whole of the subsequent life in the place of the genuine “life of faith on the Son of God,” which is first misrepresented, and then pronounced to be unsubstantial and inefficacious. But let the Professor speak for himself in reference to this case:—

“Who will dare to say, that there is any thing strange or incongruous in that theory of our spiritual life, which the Church pronounced, when, immediately the germ of life had been imparted, she administered new sustenance and food to it through the outward emblems of bread and wine?—that theory, which the Catholic Church at this day retains, though with a dimmer apprehension and fainter belief, but which a modern ignorance has rejected. And what has it substituted instead?—a speculation of spiritual vitality, nutrition, and growth, which believes life can be attained by self-agency, without being infused from without; and can be preserved by exercise, and hunger,—by doing good works, and creating aspirations of desire,—without any fresh support analogous to the reception of food.”—(pp. 391, 392.)

It is in keeping with this branch of the Tractarian system, to exalt the administrators to an ideal elevation. For truly they are invested with powers, to which no enlightened Protestant minister ever laid claim, and which, we will venture to assert, have never yet been exerted with *proved* efficiency.† All the beneficial exercise

* 1 Cor. xi. 29.

† P. 27.

of this power is concentrated in the minister of the parish. It is declared to be "running a great risk to adopt any other teacher," though our Church, less stringent and more expansive, *does* allow her members, in cases of need, to call in the aid of "*some other* discreet and learned minister of God's word."* No incompetency or ungodliness is supposed, or—if supposed—is conceived to invalidate his claims to exclusive and implicit submission. His testimony is to be received as oracular, although the Bereans were honoured with a patent of nobility for questioning the credentials of an Apostle, till they had tested them by Holy Writ.† In short, by virtue of this high commission, they are inscribed in the language of poesy, rather than of universal truth, as "men whom the young can love, and fear, and desire to imitate, and cling to with the affection of the heart, as to superior beings; whom they wonder at and reverence; whose life is a mystery to them; whose smile delights; whose frown appals them; who stand to them in the place of God, until the eye can be purged to see beyond them the real divinity which is in them."—(p. 294.)

And yet with all these high pretensions, the Professor's exhibition of the sacred office presents to our mind a very sinking degradation. The Minister is instructed to put forth his claims "as the representative of a vast body:"—

"Almost as Balaam said of old (Numb. xxiv. 13), 'If thou wouldest give me thy house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the commandment of that body, to do either good or bad of mine own mind; but what that body saith, that will I speak.'"—(p. 25.)

Now we had always considered that Ministers received their commission as delegated by our Divine Head,‡ and therefore that they were representatives, *not of the Church, but of Christ*, and that we were "so to account of them as ministers of Christ:"§ in labour, indeed, the servants of the Church, but in authority "ambassadors for Christ."|| We need scarcely remind our clerical readers, that this was *their* ordination commission. We can, indeed, understand this new delegation, as a component part of a system, impregnated with one principle—the *exaltation of the Church*. But on what scriptural warrant this great body is made to usurp the prerogative of her Head, the Professor does not instruct us.

Indeed the assumption of the claims of this "vast body" are put forth in terms entrenching upon God's own power and sovereignty, inasmuch as they stand forth without the authenticated

* P. 21, with Exhortation in Communion Service.

† P. 61, with Acts xvii. 11.

‡ John xx. 22.

§ 1 Cor. iv. 1.

|| 2 Cor. iv. 5; v. 20.

seal of his authority. *The Gospel* (will the Professor have the kindness to inform us *where?*) “constitutes the Church the minister of God, to release man from his chains.”—(p. 162.)

And again, we have the consideration presented to us—

“Of the vastness of the power claimed by the Church—a power which places it almost on a level with God himself—the power of forgiving sins, by wiping them out in baptism—of transferring souls from heaven to hell, without admitting a doubt of it, as when ‘baptised infants, it is said, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved,’—the power of bringing down the Spirit of God from heaven, and incorporating it in the persons of frail and fleshly man.”—(p. 247.) Compare pp. 279, 309, 399.

The Professor conceives it impossible “that any human being could assume this power without authority from God himself.” Yet nowhere does he furnish any proof of this delegated authority. Indeed he claims and *asserts* the “exercise of the same stupendous power, as in the first ages of Christianity.” But, as heretofore, no clue is given to us to discover the fruits of this miraculous dispensation, except it lie in the supernatural influence of the baptismal ceremony, which, *at least in its universal extent*, is far more clear to our Author’s vision than to our own.*

In truth—and it is with deep regret we state it—this Church and Sacramental system has little affinity with the sound, controuled, but yet free and enlarged, principles, which in the main governed our English Reformation. We marvel not—however we are afflicted by the thought—that the Professor should have given the weight of his authority to those “later historians,” who anticipate a general suffrage to “venerate the character of Queen Mary,” † (in comparison with her Sister) drunk though she was with the blood of the Fathers of our Reformed Church; for we discover too clearly in this system the direct path-way to Rome—the genuine slavery and formality of Popery, in contradistinction to those more unfettered Scriptural doctrines, for which our martyrs “loved not their lives unto the death.”

And now—having exhibited so heavy a per contra account—it would be no less injustice to our Author than to our own feelings, to refrain from adducing some points in which we cordially agree, and where we readily confess ourselves to have been instructed. The following conveys, in few words, a most important ethical distinction:—

“In studying human ethics, we take our own feelings, knowledge, experience, or conscience, as the test of true and false, each individual for himself, and on each particular point. We may therefore acknowledge it in parts: Christianity we must take as a whole, without any deduction or reservation.”—(p. 42.)

* Pp. 247, 248.

† P. 379.

directions. "Rejoice evermore" * And what faithful Christian does not feel his "joy to be our strength"† for service; and that to cramp our privileges—to cloud our sunshine—is proportionably to palsy our strength?

We have left ourselves but small space to remark upon the style of this work. The Professor's lively imagination throws an unusual cast of interest over many a dry portion of the field of ethics. We observe traces of haste in an occasional want of reverential tone of writing—very foreign, we are persuaded, to our author's habit of mind. The idea of the Almighty God working "by fits and starts,"‡ and the illustration of the chess-player, in immediate connexion with the most solemn contemplation of Calvary,† will be deemed offences against serious taste. The meretricious tinge of the Patristic school is sufficiently manifest in the remote and fanciful types of Sacramental ordinances, which, in common with the Fathers, he finds in the incidents of Old Testament history.§ Probably his metaphysical speculations upon the Trinity in man will be regarded of this character.||

Upon the whole, to those who have Scripturally laid their foundation principles of "Morals," Professor Sewell's work will furnish much valuable assistance in the superstructure. But if a lax theology is the parent of lax morals, defective and erroneous theology must fail in producing sound, well-principled "Christian Morals." The system divested of its simplicity of principle, is stripped of its essential Christian character. It administers to self-righteousness, not to self-abasement;—to "bodily exercise"—not to evangelical godliness. It exalts ordinances; not Christ;—the Church; not her glorious Head. The chief defect in Professor Sewell's book is, that the Saviour is not the Sun of the Moral System, and we know of no other source of life. True indeed, we catch a dim or occasional glimpse through the reflection of the Church; but this is a feeble compensation for the deficiency of the invigorating glow of his direct rays. That this book however will be extensively read, we cannot doubt. We would only wish, that its readers may be deeply sensible of the need of accurate discrimination; bringing every statement to the touchstone of the Word of God; "so discerning those things that differ," "that they may approve those things" only "that are more excellent."¶

* 1 Thess. v. 16. † Neb. viii. 10. ‡ P. 53. § P. 155.
 || P. 355. Compare pp. 323, 324. ¶ Pp. 256, 258. ** Phil. i. 9, with M. R.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL AND POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE POPES OF ROME, *during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* By LEOPOLD RANKE, Professor of German in the University of Berlin. Translated from the German by SARAH AUSTIN.

THE literature of Modern Germany, like the architecture of Ancient Egypt, is characterized by a rude but a colossal greatness. It wants the connexion and the keeping which belong to the specimens of a classic age, but it atones for the want by an immensity of purpose which is all its own. There is a grandeur in the design, a boldness in the outline, a vastness in the proportions which awes and overwhelms the mind. In the Apollo Belvidere or the Venus di Medici we contemplate the perfection of symmetry, and the charm of art which has begun by imitating nature, and has ended by surpassing its instructress: but the statue of the great Rameses, shattered though it be by the hand of violence, and strewn in fragments over the arena which it once adorned, inspires us with feelings of a far different nature. We gaze upon a hand that exceeds by twofold the entire size of the human body; a foot beneath whose living tread, had it been inspired with life, the forms of earth would have crumbled into dust; and the sensation that overwhelms us is one of astonishment at the daring that designed a figure of such gigantic proportions; at the amount of labour that was expended in its formation; nay even at the very force that must have been employed to effect its destruction.

The great literary works of Modern Germany affect the reader in a somewhat similar manner. Four writers especially have risen up in that country, on whose imperishable productions the features of a colossal greatness are impressed; Niebuhr, the historian of Rome, Müller, Raumer, and Ranke. We examine the different parts of their respective works, and we find much to censure. Some of their theories appear visionary and unfounded; and their style will bear no comparison with the graphic terseness of Thucydides, or the flowing periods of Xenophon. But if we regard the works of these mighty masters as a whole, the sensation which they inspire will be one of wonder and astonishment. They have toiled in the mine of ages; they have pierced through the superincumbent mass; they have descended to and examined the primary strata; they have brought the treasures of antiquity to light; and have exhumed facts that lay buried under the ruins of a primeval world. We lose sight of their errors, in admiration of the spirit that has dared, and

the labour that has effected so much ; and are fain to confess that, whatever be their faults, at least there belongs to them the merit of accomplishing, what none but themselves could have performed, none but themselves would have attempted.

These observations apply in their full force to the volumes of Ranke. They are entitled "The Ecclesiastical and Political History of the Popes of Rome, during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries ;" but this title, as the translator has observed, "does not accurately represent the subject of the book, which is not so much a history of the popes, as a history of the great struggle between catholicism and protestantism, in which the popes were indeed actors, but generally rather as the servants than the rulers of events." The author commences with a brief review of the more remarkable epochs of the papacy ; he proceeds to take a survey of the church and the ecclesiastical states at the beginning of the sixteenth century ; he glances briefly at the immediate developement of the Reformation in Germany ; and then hurries on to what may be considered the great object of his work—the causes which checked the advancing power of Protestantism, forced it to pause in the midst of its triumphs, and rendered it doubtful for a time, whether the efforts of Rome to recover her lost dominion would not be crowned with entire success. This problem solved, the struggle examined in its progress, and brought to its apparent conclusion by the conditions of the peace of Westphalia, he seems to consider that his task is ended ; and although he adds a short sketch of the papacy in its decline, he distinctly implies that in doing so he somewhat exceeds the more accurate limits of his work, and makes a sacrifice to the curiosity of the reader, with whom the question must naturally arise—"Did Rome patiently acquiesce in the terms prescribed to her ? What then were the causes that influenced her decision ? In what new enterprises was her strength expended ? To what objects was her policy addressed ?"

We suspect, however, that another motive, perhaps hardly apparent to himself, induced Ranke to continue his narrative. He concludes his seventh book with a confident prediction, which the repose of a century and a half might seem to warrant, "By these events eternal barriers were erected against the progress of catholicism, which has now its assigned and definite limits ; nor can its most ardent or sanguine partisans entertain any serious thought of that conquest of the world, which they once contemplated and projected. Indeed the intellectual developement of Europe has rendered this impossible." "Never more can the thought of exalting the one or the other confession to universal supremacy find place among men. The only consideration now is, how each state, each

people can best proceed from the basis of its own politico-religious principles, to the developement of its intellectual and moral powers." But though the period of religious quiet, commencing with the peace of Westphalia, had been of so long continuance; it could hardly have escaped the penetrating glance of Ranke, that the genius of popery would only remain inactive under the compulsion of a strong necessity; that its nature was opposed to rest, and that like the giant of fable, although bound down and fettered, it would still renew the struggle, as soon as a favourable opportunity should occur: neither could he have shut his eyes to the fact, that some symptoms of its renewed energy were already apparent, and that Europe even now was heaving throughout its length and breadth with the convulsive efforts of the imprisoned spirit. In this inward sentiment we think we find a reason for the continuation of his narrative. "It forms," he says, "no part of the purpose of this work to describe the modern phases of the papacy;" but still he proceeds, for the thought had crossed his mind, What if this scorned and enfeebled power should burst the bonds that confine it, and should attempt the recovery of its lost dominion with a zeal disciplined and corrected by its past miscarriages! That this idea had suggested itself, is evident from the closing paragraph of the preface, written after the commencement of the existing dispute between Prussia and the Papal See; although there it is only hinted at to be disavowed: it may be traced with still more distinctness in the concluding pages of the eighth book, where the writer admits, that "if we were to look only at the efforts of the hierarchical party and its opponents, we should be led to fear that a deadly war was ready to break out between them afresh, to convulse the world, and to revive the old animosities in all their bitterness;" and that "the future alone can shew to what this state of things may eventually lead."

We may regard the work of Ranke in two different points of view, as a survey of the political history of Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as far as that history is influenced or affected by religion; or in its more strictly ecclesiastical character, as an account of the struggle between popery and protestantism. Viewed in the former of these lights, the volumes of Ranke demand a place among the noblest historical monuments, which have been erected in past or present times. He has spared no labour: he has ransacked the literary treasures of Berlin, Vienna, Venice, and Rome, and has discovered sources of information which were unknown to preceding authors. He has unravelled the intricacies of European policy, and has shewed how extensively it was influenced and directed by the active spirit, the skilful address and subtle

diplomacy of the Roman curia. Above all he is strictly impartial. His work has been already translated into the French and English languages, and must ever maintain an European reputation, not so much because it fills up an acknowledged desideratum in history, as because it is itself the only appendix to the history of modern times, which explains every difficulty and reconciles every apparent contradiction.

But the work of Ranke is in its very nature religious. He discusses questions in themselves strictly ecclesiastical, and only secularized by the admixture of temporal interests which were inseparable from their agitation, and have affected their settlement. The vital interests of Christianity are involved in the subject of which he undertakes to treat, and proportioned to the ability which he has displayed, and to the high character which attaches to his book, as a necessary supplement to the history of modern Europe, must be its influence for good or for evil upon the religious opinions of his readers. We feel that the paramount importance of this consideration justifies us in examining his sentiments with somewhat of a jealous feeling, and in directing attention not only to what he has stated, but still more to what he has omitted to state. Indeed the faults with which we must charge him are mostly of a negative kind.

In the first place, we think that in reviewing the immediate causes of the Reformation, he vastly underrates the influence of the Scriptures. Were not their translation into the vernacular languages of Europe, and the multiplication of copies by means of the newly-discovered art of printing, the main engines by which popery was assailed? Was it not the *Bible* that effected a practicable breach in the ramparts? Was it not to the Bible that the Reformers appealed? Was it not against the circulation of the Bible that Rome guarded with the most jealous precaution? We feel so convinced that this view of the matter is correct, that we hold it to be one of the most remarkable signs of a divine interference in behalf of the Reformation, that the art of printing immediately preceded it, and prepared the way for its advance. Had it not been for this aid, it could scarcely have made much progress, without a miracle. Indeed Ranke seems to admit this, when he describes the care employed in Roman Catholic countries to prevent the introduction of proscribed books, of which the Bible was always one; and marks, as a solitary exception to the general policy of Rome, the permission to retain the Scriptures which was wrung from her by the Roman Catholic cantons of Switzerland. And yet, strange to say, while he dwells at length upon the secular character of the papacy—the general relaxation of morals and discipline—the reviving taste for classic literature; in fact upon all the other causes, which aided the

Reformation in its developement and progress ; he omits the consideration of its great and moving cause ; he forgets to add that the universal degeneracy was rendered apparent because the mirror of truth was held up to it—that it was the partial diffusion of a heavenly light that made the darkness visible by the contrast which it afforded.

Closely connected with this omission, and probably arising from the same cause—a determination on the part of the writer to confine himself to the political bearings of his subject—is the low view which he takes of protestant principles, at least in their operation, for whenever he speaks of them in the abstract, he speaks of them with becoming respect. It seems as though he considered that on both sides of the question secular motives were mainly influential, and that religion was but the watchword, which distinguished the two hostile parties in the encounter. We could not help pausing repeatedly to ask ourselves the question,—Was this the spirit of the Reformation ? We looked in vain in the pages of Ranke for the warm glow of religious zeal—for the patience of the martyr, and the fervour of the saint. Real Christianity seemed confined to a few ecclesiastics, or its more general dissemination might be gathered from an incidental notice, that the Inquisition had sacrificed so many victims within a certain period ; but the mighty interests of the Christian church seemed to fluctuate with every new relation assumed by the powers of Europe ; to change with the changing views of statesmen ; and to be decided by the most unworthy actors upon the most unworthy grounds.

The reader must bear constantly in mind that his attention is directed to the conduct of courts and cabinets ; that it is of them and of their motives and principles, rendered influential by the position which they occupied, that the author speaks ; and he must be on his guard lest his soul be secularized, and he be led to suppose that the spirit of the Reformation was not in reality deeply and pre-eminently religious ; a conclusion which would be utterly unfounded, although in some degree countenanced by the work of Ranke. It is but the surface of ocean that is agitated by the varying breezes that sweep over its azure plain ; the depth of waters below continues in unchanged repose. It is the visible—the external which is affected by the shifting gales of policy, that exercise an influence on courts and cabinets ; but the moral feeling of the mass, the depth of religious conviction and power that lies at the heart of a nation, remains all the while unfathomed and unknown. We feel it necessary thus carefully to guard our readers against the error of underrating the religious spirit of the Reformation, because, from the very nature of his work, it is not prominently set forth in the volumes of Ranke.

There are two other points which require to be noted. We dislike the dispassionate calmness with which he speaks of the establishment of the Inquisition, and describes that bloody system of unrelenting cruelty, by which Rome endeavoured to arrest, and succeeded in partially arresting, the progress of the Reformation. Strict impartiality is, we think, consistent with the most marked abhorrence of papal tyranny; nor is it any apology for the guilt of Rome, that the principles of toleration were everywhere disregarded in the sixteenth century. There is this marked difference between her persecutions and those of Protestant states, that she sacrificed her victims professedly upon religious grounds: they vindicated, often we allow with undue severity, the insulted and outraged majesty of the law against those who taught that it was no crime to dethrone or even to assassinate heretical princes—that it was an act of piety to overthrow heretical governments, and that the eye of heaven looked down with complacency and satisfaction upon the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the murder of William of Nassau.

We dislike too the *German* indifference which our author occasionally manifests in speaking of forms and systems of Christianity. That his own creed is sound in the main may be inferred from many passages of his work: but is he sure that even *he* is not indebted for this soundness to the scriptural teaching of a Protestant church? Has he forgotten that it is an effort of inconceivable difficulty to break through the trammels of early education—an effort of which the strongest minds are hardly capable, and to which large masses of men never aspire except at periods of peculiar excitement? For ourselves, we remember where it is written, “How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?” And while we yield to none in that Catholic charity, “which believeth all things, hopeth all things,” even under the most unfavourable circumstances; which recognizes with heartfelt satisfaction the important truth, that the operation of the Spirit is not limited by forms, and that He can kindle the vital spark of religion in the breast of the Romanist or the Protestant, according to his own will: we cannot on the other hand shut our eyes to the fact, that pure and scriptural doctrines are the instruments by which He generally works; and that where these are upheld, *there* only is an extensive blessing vouchsafed. “The profounder spirits on either side may indeed gradually recur with more knowledge, with larger and deeper insight, with more freedom from the fetters of cramping church formularies, to the eternal principles of genuine and spiritual religion; and may attain to the more perfect appre-

hension of the spiritually true and immutable which lies at the bottom of all forms, but can be expressed by none, in its whole infinite extent ;” but let these eternal principles, these spiritual abstractions be once substituted in Protestant countries for creeds and forms and systems—let the Church once forsake her high and holy calling, as the teacher and upholder of *positive* truth, and the tides of superstition and infidelity will rush in from opposite sides over the ruined bulwarks of Christianity, and will meet at last in fearful conflict, when they have obliterated every trace of real and vital religion. We have thought it right thus candidly to state, where we consider the views of Ranke deficient or faulty. We now enter upon the more agreeable task of exhibiting his merits in an ecclesiastical point of view.

His book is a book of facts and principles. To the great principles therefore which he establishes and developes we direct our attention, without pausing to dwell on minor points. Principles remain the same in every age ; and our own times present so many points of resemblance to the early part of the sixteenth century, that the practical lessons of that period are peculiarly valuable to us.

It is a striking fact, that Ranke traces the origin of the Reformation to the reviving taste for classic literature, which was diffused through Italy and the west of Europe by the instrumentality of Leo the Tenth and his immediate predecessors. Popes and cardinals sought rather to be celebrated as patrons of the liberal arts, than to appear in their proper character of ministers of religion. The education which Italy fostered, and which Italian influence disseminated, had nothing in common with Christianity. It laboured not to inculcate Christian principles ; it took no account of Christian duties, content with the bright but cold abstractions of Greece and Rome ; and the effect of such a system was quickly manifested in general infidelity and looseness of morals ; in an utter neglect of their sacred calling on the part of the priesthood, on the part of the laity in indifference and apathy. The sterner spirit of the northern nations revolted at a sight so unseemly. It is recorded that the youthful Luther was filled with astonishment when he visited Italy. “ At the very moment that the offering of the mass was finished, the priests uttered words of blasphemy which denied its efficacy. It was the tone of good society in Rome to question the evidences of Christianity. No one passed for an accomplished man who did not entertain heretical opinions ; at the court the ordinances of the Catholic church and passages of holy writ were spoken of only in a jesting manner ; the mysteries of the faith were despised.” A violent

reaction took place in the minds of men, and they were naturally led to investigate the claims of a church which appeared so utterly corrupt.

The attempt to divest education of a religious character struck down Rome in the height of her power. She perceived her fault, and set about remedying it with that calculating policy which has always distinguished her: but one half of the Roman world was lost to her, we trust for ever!

The means which she employed to recover her sovereignty are examined by Ranke with much attention. The organization of the Society of Jesus, and the remodelling of the other monastic orders, were amongst the most efficient. To the zeal and activity of the Jesuits in particular too much influence can hardly be ascribed. They always appear in the advance of the Papal forces. To them was assigned the assault upon the outworks of Protestantism. Their aim was to establish schools, and to obtain the monopoly of instruction. They succeeded in their object to a great extent. The Protestant fathers passed away; and their children, whom they had sent to the schools of the Jesuits, where a liberal education might be obtained gratuitously, relapsed into Popery, and became its most zealous defenders. Then followed the re-establishment of the bishops and priests in the cathedrals and churches which had been taken from them: persecution came in their train, and the Jesuits passed on to some new scene of operation; and gathering there, like birds of evil omen, seemed by their presence to announce the coming storm.

About the middle of the sixteenth century the religious character of Popery had been completely restored. The supreme Pontiff felt that he must adapt himself to the altered spirit of the times. With Paul the Third this change was probably the result of policy. In Paul the Fourth the monastic feelings of an earlier age seemed to live and breathe afresh. It was he who re-established the Inquisition; and this fearful engine of despotic power acting in conformity with the decrees of the Council of Trent, which had done much for Popery by defining its principles and doctrines, was urged forward to the attack upon Protestantism with cold, calculating, relentless determination.

But there are two features in the struggle on which Ranke has dwelt at great length, and which seem especially deserving of notice. Rome succeeded in recovering a large part of her lost dominion, not so much through her own reviving energy, as through the divisions of Protestantism. On the one hand there was a perfect consistency of purpose, on the other jealousy and distrust. Each Protestant sect laid claim to truth as its own

exclusive domain, and denounced those who differed from its own communion. Whither should the cautious and hesitating fly but to the only church which presented a semblance of unity? It is a painful thing to doubt; and men took refuge from their own misgivings, or escaped from the labour of protracted inquiry, to the shelter of the one fold which appeared free from the prevailing distractions. The leading feature of this reaction was a blind submission to authority. With the Jesuits, for instance, obedience was the highest duty. It took precedence of the investigation of truth, and, as a necessary result, arrested it.

The ruin of the Huguenot party in France may be mainly traced to want of organization—to the absence of a system radiating from a common centre. An episcopal constitution would have supplied this deficiency: but how in its absence should independent and insulated congregations maintain a successful struggle against the power, the system, the policy of Rome? There existed too on the continent of Europe a general suspicion that Protestantism was hostile to the existing forms of civil government, which seemed to derive confirmation from the events which took place in Scotland, Bohemia, the Netherlands, and England successively. This suspicion the Popes industriously fostered, and made abundant use of it in France, Bavaria, and Austria, where the civil power co-operated with them, influenced, as Ranke considers, by a feeling that its own security was endangered by the principles of the Reformation.

But as Rome recovered much of her lost ground through the dissensions and errors of Protestantism, so is it to Rome herself that the cessation of the conflict must be mainly ascribed. She feared lest she should find a master in the power which she had invoked to her aid. There was something alarming in the very name of an Emperor of Germany, and in the recollections which it still called up. She trembled for her Italian dominions; hesitated for a moment; and then, with a deliberate preference of her secular to her spiritual interests, paused in the midst of her triumphant career, and made common cause with the Protestants against the leading power of her own communion.

The policy of Rome has since this period been mainly directed to the security of her own states. We find her, in her jealousy of French influence beyond the Alps, even countenancing the attempt of William of Orange upon England. Her exhausted treasury paralyzed her efforts, while the misery and distress prevailing amongst the inhabitants of the Campagna seemed to invite revolt, and tempt invasion. Her spirit had again become wholly secular; and a new nobility, composed of the families which had furnished

the popes and cardinals of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, had once more transformed her into the capital of literature and art, rather than of religion. Ranke guides us through this process of degeneracy, and traces it to its primary causes. The stream of light which he has thrown upon the darker pages of ecclesiastical history enables us to see our way plainly, instead of groping in the obscurity of twilight. May it never be the province of some future historian to detail the fresh exertions of Rome, and to tell how the nineteenth century witnessed her renewed attempts at universal dominion! Her objects need be no longer secular. The balance of power in Europe, and the mutual jealousy of European cabinets protect her in the peaceable possession of her own states; and the first act of Pius the Seventh on his restoration to those states by the allied powers—the re-establishment of the order of Jesuits, seems sufficiently to indicate the policy which the Papal court may henceforward be expected to adopt.

TALES OF THE VILLAGE. By FRANCIS E. PAGET, M.A.,
Rector of Elford, and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford.
Burns. 'Englishman's Library,' No. LIX.

NOTWITHSTANDING the humble designation of this work, it is written by no less a personage than one of the Chaplains of the Lord Bishop of Oxford; and occupies a place in the series of the 'Englishman's Library,' immediately preceding that most talented but most perplexing work, at which the arrows of criticism can only take effect when sped from a bow like that of Ulysses—the "Christian Morals of Professor Sewell." And 'Tales of the Village' is a work not unworthy of such association, being indicative of very considerable, and perhaps in its way almost equal ability. It is a mixture 'of divinity, and history, and novel, and tragedy, and the confessions of the professed author,' very ingeniously compounded, and blending into a kind of mental aliment for not very profound readers—that is, for ninety-nine out of every hundred—containing some few deleterious ingredients, but on the whole, if taken with proper precaution and under suitable regimen, simple, sweet, and salutary. We shall accordingly endeavour thus to present it to our readers, first pointing out Mr. Paget's object, which will of itself operate as an antidote to the questionable infusion, without impairing the zest and savour of that which is essentially and intrinsically good.

Be it known, therefore, to all who may be disposed to admit into the domestic or parochial library the 'Tales of the Village,' that the author undertakes to represent two extremes of error, and a middle way of truth. The two extremes are Roman Catholicism, or rather Romanism, and ultra-Protestantism; the 'middle way' is what we suppose he would denominate Anglo-Catholicism—a term however which involves just as much of a contradiction as the other, and therefore we may be permitted to designate it Anglo-Churchism. The representative of Romanism is Magdalen Fernley, a very amiable, candid, and rational young person, but one who does not, according to the statute in this case made and provided, concentrate in herself, though the heroine of the novel portion, all the attractions under the sun; for though her voice was 'ever soft, gentle, and low, an excellent thing in woman,' she had no pretensions to beauty, and belonged only to the subordinate class of 'countenances which are pleasing, and with an expression full of gentleness and humility.' The representative of ultra-Protestantism is a Mrs. Hopkins, who is of course a direct contrast to the demure and pensive Magdalen: she has a countenance like other people, but nothing is said about its expression, which, in a married woman or widow is a thing of very little moment—'of unpleasant manners,' a kind of theological pendulum, vibrating alternately between the parish church and the dissenting chapel, and ticking with an incessant and unwearied volubility quite odious to ears polite. This worthy personage attempts to intermeddle with the divinity portion of the narrative; but 'what should be great she turns to farce,' and shines therefore, if she shines at all, in the comedy. Her first introduction to her opposite (we must not say her contradictory, (for Magdalen, with the characteristic meekness and forbearance of her tolerant and long-suffering church, is too mild to offer contradiction) is described in language which really proves that Mr. Paget has a considerable turn for the ludicrous, and reminds one not a little of the quaint and broad drollery which distinguishes the chronicler of Parson Dolittle and Doctor Dronish, though we doubt whether the author of the 'Village Tales' will thank us for suggesting a comparison with the writer of the 'Village Dialogues.' We think however even the latter could hardly furnish us with a *Rowland* for our Oliver in a comic sketch to equal the following:—

" ' Mrs. Sutton at home, young woman? Oh, gone to Yateshull, is she? Perhaps her niece—(ah, granddaughter is she?)—perhaps her granddaughter, Miss Furnival—(Fernley?—yes, true)—Miss Fernley is in the house? Very well, young woman—(by the way, what's your own name? Susan Bennet. Bennets of Dilbury?—thought so)—then Susan Bennet, I'll trouble you to tell Miss Fernley that Mrs. Hopkins will be happy to wait on

her, and rest till Mrs. Sutton comes home, for I'm just tired to death. Or stay, I'll tell her that myself. Clogs ?—thank you ; but I can take them off. And you may hang this cloak to the fire,—not too near, you know, or you'll scorch it, Susan. This way, to the right, up one step? Oh! what, in the blind gentleman's apartment? poor old creature!—Ah, my good friend, Mr. Lee,' as soon as she was within the door, 'happy to see you looking so well, sir.—Beg your pardon, ma'am, take it for granted you are Miss Fernley. Great pleasure in making your acquaintance—very sincere regard for your grandmother—should have waited on you sooner, but I caught a terrible cold on Tuesday at Chatterton—annual meeting of the Reformation Society, you know—sad wet evening, but I make a point of attending: think it a duty in these times. Great crowd on the platform—very hot—didn't get home till midnight—rained all the way. Mr. Warlingham too? quite in luck to find so many of my friends,—really quite a congregation,—a vicar, and a curate, and the black cat for clerk—ha, ha, ha! and you, Miss Fernley, no doubt a very attentive listener. Puss, puss, puss,—come pussy.' "(p. 93.)

But we have nothing to say of the 'retreating quadruped,' who performed the office 'of clerk,' and must do as Mrs. Hopkins did, fall back upon the bipeds, the Vicar and the Curate, of whom the latter, a blind man, advanced in years, and rejoicing in the somewhat incongruous name of Cyprian Lee, is intended to embody Mr. Paget's beau-ideal of a Church of England saint. And, to speak the honest truth, his portrait is sketched, in the earlier part of the work, with so much beauty, delicacy, and skill—we find so much that is attractive in his piety, and so little that is repellant in his asceticism, that the juxta-position of Mrs. Hopkins reminds us of that whimsical arrangement in our picture galleries which, perhaps for the sake of contrast, suspends a broad scene of Flemish humours, a carousal, a quarrel, or a fair, or some sportive creation of Wilkie, beside the sublime and awful representation of Scriptural miracles ; or that still more capricious extravagance of Gothic architecture, which carves a grinning demon between cherubs with expanded wings, and seems to anticipate the vagaries of modern symbolism by interspersing throughout our sacred places

" Gorgons, and hydras, and chimeras dire."

Mrs. Hopkins would have been like the hydra, had her shoulders supported more than one head ; and like the Gorgon, if talking nonsense would petrify the unwilling listener ; while as the representative of ultra-Protestantism we hope she is a chimera too. We pity Mr. Paget most sincerely, if in real life he has ever stumbled upon her parallel.

Seriously speaking, however, we doubt whether it is candid—we are sure it is not charitable—to attack opinions, however erroneous and even heretical, in the judgment of the writer, they may be, by drawing a caricature, and taking it as the representative of a class. The Vicar above-mentioned, who professes himself the

author of the book, excuses himself for not following Mrs. Hopkins through the mere ordinary gossip of a morning call; and then, rather inconsistently, goes on to record the following gossip, which has no other merit than that of being *extra-ordinary*. The good lady has fallen foul of her parish-minister, with whom of course she is very far from being satisfied, this being doubtless an essential attribute of ultra-Protestantism.

“ ‘It was not,’ she observed, ‘the dulness of Mr. Dashwood’s manner to which I alluded, so much as to the subjects of his discourse. Such dry, marrowless, moral compositions, Sabbath after Sabbath, with neither spirit nor life in them. Such a prosy oration as we had the day before yesterday about evil speaking,—just as if people needed teaching on that subject.’

“ ‘Surely, madam,’ interposed Mr. Lee, ‘it is a point on which people require to be *reminded* very frequently, even if they do not require to be instructed. It is very painful to think how much of common conversation is made up of ill-natured remarks about our neighbours and their affairs.’

“ ‘Very true, sir; but what else is there to talk about?’ said Mrs. Hopkins. ‘Really any person who moves in decent society is expected to have something to say for themselves, and to know what is going on in the world.’

“ ‘I grant you,’ replied Mr. Lee, ‘that *the world* requires this. But to which are we to hearken? to the world, or to God? It has ever appeared to me, that one of the most awful passages in the Bible is the declaration of our blessed Lord, that “for every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account in the day of judgment.” I call this most awful, because it affords a sample of the *extent* to which the inquiry will be carried, and of the minuteness and particularity of the investigation which will take place at the last day; and surely, if we are to be judged for every “idle” (that is, for every useless, unedifying, unprofitable) word, the mischief-maker, the tattler, the backbiter, and the slanderer, must be in the utmost peril. And if there be such at Norton (and what village is free from them?) surely Mr. Dashwood’s admonitions were not altogether superfluous.’

“ ‘Oh, he certainly made some hard hits,’ replied Mrs. Hopkins; ‘and I couldn’t help thinking, all the time he preached, how some folks’ ears must be tingling. Thought I to myself, This is a very wholesome lesson for the widow Liptrot. If you’ll believe me, Mr. Lee, for a very plain, middle-aged woman, that’s the most intriguing, sneering, foul-mouthed, meddlesome busybody in the whole parish. And there’s Miss Prowle, too—(there really ought to be a law to make old maids work instead of talk)—Miss Prowle, for all she looks so meek, I verily think that she is at the bottom of every ill-natured tale that is told within five miles of us. To be sure, Mr. Dashwood’s sermon was very wholesome for them.’

“ ‘And probably for many others,’ said I, ‘if they would receive it, and apply it.’

“ ‘No doubt, sir; and no doubt Mr. Dashwood is a very respectable, well-intentioned, good kind of a man,—for the light he has; but there is nothing of what I call high and deep doctrine in his discourses. Dear me! I wish you could have heard Mr. Crackenthorpe at Chatterton, or Mr. Wayland when he preached at M——. Mr. Wayland, you know, has that chapel in the Borough. All London goes to listen to him: carriages begin to set down at nine o’clock in the morning, though the service don’t begin till eleven; the aisles are crammed to suffocation; the pulpit-stairs are filled with fine ladies; there is not so much as standing-room left in the organ-loft. Only to think how he is run after! I am credibly informed that he received sixteen proposals by the twopenny post, four of them from heiresses, in the course of last season. And no wonder. Never was such grace, such eloquence, such a voice, such a flow of words, quite like a flood, or a cataract,

or—I don't know what it was like, but I felt in a tremor all over me. Did you ever hear Mr. Wayland, ma'am?

" 'No, madam,' said Magdalen Fernley, in a tone which, though it conveyed no particular meaning to Mrs. Hopkins, was sufficiently intelligible to Mr. Lee and myself.

" 'Then I hope you will take an early opportunity of doing so. An hour and fifty minutes did he preach by the clock in the gallery at M—, and I declare I didn't think it half as long as one of Mr. Dashwood's twenty-minute sermons. Such volubility! he never stops, never stumbles; and you might have heard a pin drop all the while, if one poor thing had not been in hysterics. Everybody was sitting in breathless expectation of what might come next.'

" 'Not without reason, madam, I should apprehend. But pray,' I asked, 'is Mr. Wayland a clergyman of the Church of England?'

" 'Why not exactly, I believe. He has some conscientious scruples, and some few particular opinions, I understand. But he is quite orthodox enough—really very church-of-Englandish; and if there are any points of difference, hardly anybody, not one in a hundred perhaps, would find them out.'

" Magdalen Fernley looked up at me with an expression which seemed to ask, whether it was possible that such things could be, and that a church-woman could actually view schism with indifference. I thought it better to make no remark at the time, and indeed Mrs. Hopkins hardly afforded me the opportunity of introducing a word.

" 'And then,' she continued, 'the surprising thing is, that the whole of these wonderful discourses are extempore; not so much as a scrap of paper with a note on it to help him. He often does not think of his text till he is half-way up the pulpit-stairs. Oh, he is a first-rate man! quite a jewel to sit under; that is what I call the true, saving way of preaching.'

" 'No doubt,' said I: 'it saves *trouble*, but I should fear little else.'"—(pp. 96—99.)

Why will Mr. Paget force upon us comparisons with an author whose name 'a critic must not speak,' when he designates his ultra-Protestant preacher as Mr. Crackenthorpe of Chatterton, and his ultra-Protestant hearer as Miss Giggleswick, thus marking the impression to be conveyed as clearly as when his predecessor in village theology talks of Parson Dolittle and Dr. Dronish? Why does he represent a preacher who is 'not exactly of the Church of England,' as orthodox enough for ultra-Protestants? Why does he charge all those who cannot digest his sweeping and startling assertion—"that there is no peace or *safety* without the pale of the Church of England,"—with the absurdity of supposing that it is 'the true saving way of preaching' to pour out a torrent of extemporaneous crudities, on texts not selected till 'the first-rate man is half way up the pulpit-stairs?' If Mr. Paget really believes all this of the ultra-Protestants, we are astonished at his simplicity—if he does not, why, by relating it as truth, should he practise upon the simplicity of others? We cannot but apply to him the censure of the Poet,

" Pergis pugnancia secum
Frontibus adversis componere? "

Why will he be so disingenuous as to combine, merely for the

condemnation of the ultra-Protestants, things which have no connection with each other? Many a liberal and enlightened Protestant—many a clergyman to whom these epithets belong in the genuine and literal, not the perverted and prostituted sense—though he will not talk about the ‘altar,’ and considers ‘turning to the east during the recitation of the creed’ among the non-essentials—is yet as particular about saying the Athanasian Creed, on all occasions which the Church prescribes, and bows as habitually and as devoutly at the holy name of Jesus, as Mr. Paget himself can do—while as to the high crime and misdemeanour of ‘repairing the cross at the gable end of the church,’ which Mr. Paget’s ultra-Protestant oracle denounces as downright popery, we can only say that we are aware of many country parishes in which the clergy are distinguished for their attachment to Protestant principles, and yet the gable end, not only of the Church itself, but also of the subsidiary church-buildings, the newly-erected parochial or infant school, is surmounted with the symbol of our redemption. As to the two implied charges against the ‘ultra-Protestant’ clergy, they surely cannot be censured by a Bishop’s chaplain for speaking of the ‘Lord’s Table’ rather than ‘the altar,’ when the former phrase occurs ten times in the Rubric, and the Order of Administration for the Lord’s Supper, the latter *not once*; nor is it a very grievous departure from the principles of church-fellowship, if they recite the creed, as the church enjoins, standing; but use their own discretion about what she does *not* enjoin—the turning to the east or to the west. Had these insinuations of irregularity been merely introduced into the story as the absurd effusions of a silly woman, we should have said that they were perfectly in character; but when Mr. Paget designates this chapter ‘the ultra-Protestant’—when he represents the errors of Mrs. Hopkins as Protestant errors, and her opinions as those of the ultra-Protestant section of the Church of England (we use the word as it is used by Mr. Paget, neither admitting its correctness nor being responsible for its application)—when he sums up at the close by the grave statement of an old divine, ‘surely there is no way so effectual to betray the truth as to procure for it a weak defender’—we may well retort upon him with the question whence such a weak defender could be procured, save from the inventive imagination of Mr. Paget himself? It is surely no great effort of literary heroism to conjure up an ultra-Protestant phantom, and then run it through the body with a lance of one’s own fabrication. ‘Give me the premises,’ says Mr. Paget, ‘and I will give you the conclusion.’ ‘Nay,’ his opponents will reply if they are wise, ‘you are the author of the one, and you are quite welcome to the ownership of the other.’

We object, then, to the sixth chapter of this volume, as the ebullition of Mr. Paget's prejudices, rather than the expression of his principles. We object to it, as proceeding altogether upon the false assumption, that those who are farthest from Rome are farthest also from common sense. We object to it, consequently, as calculated to mislead, rather than to inform, those who may be willing to take their notions of what this writer is pleased to call ultra-Protestantism at second hand. Much more honest, and therefore much more useful, would the volume have been, if the Author had taken some accredited work of the party which he terms ultra-Protestant, and dealt with it as fairly as he has dealt with the opposing extreme of error: if he had placed judicious and sensible arguments in the mouth of a judicious and sensible person, and then addressed himself to the self-imposed office of refuting the imaginary antagonist. This might have spoiled the comedy of his book, but it would have improved the divinity, without detracting from the grace of the history, or the interest of the 'narrative,' or the pathos of the tragedy—it would only have been the sacrifice of a little not very ingenious fiction upon the altar of truth. Trusting that Mr. Paget will take this hint in good part, and that, if it should come under his notice, it may exercise a favourable influence upon his future volumes, we will not hesitate to acknowledge, that the work contains much of narrative that is interesting, much of argument that is forcible, much of divinity that is scriptural and sound. The controversy between the Anglican Clergyman and the Roman Catholic Catechist is conducted in a spirit of moderation and forbearance on either side, which only leads us to regret that the author was not, in this instance, a model to himself; and though we might hesitate as to an occasional expression, yet we scruple not to recommend for attentive perusal, and as especially suited to the times in which we live, the seventh and eighth chapters. We cannot indeed wholly accord with the concluding expressions of the latter—we think, that while the Church of England is armed for the contest "with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," she will derive little of real strength from the feeble aids of 'antiquity and tradition'—and that she would rather adopt the language of David, "I cannot fight with these, for I have not proved them." But, when the giant of papal superstition shall fall prostrate before "the tried stone,"—before the greater son of David,—before the faithful and true witness bearing the two-edged sword of truth, the work of decapitation will be performed, not by patristical antiquity, but by primitive apostolicity—not by tradition, but by the word of God.

The winding-up of the narrative may have been anticipated

from its commencement. After a long, patient, and painful process of investigation, Magdalen Fernley is brought into communion with the Church of England; and instead of immuring herself as a 'sister professed' among St. Clares or Benedictines, becomes the inmate of an English parsonage, in the character of the Pastor's wife. Mrs. Hopkins, though so often foiled in the contest with theological weapons, takes to herself the whole merit of the conversion (we are not informed whether she took any part in making up the match that followed it), and Cyprian Lee evinces, in his decline and death, the power of those principles which he had professed and exemplified during life. Here at least the author treads upon ground which does not give way beneath his feet; abandoning the questionable material of antiquity and tradition, which from some previous parts of the narrative, if pressed to their legitimate and necessary consequences, he appeared to have intermingled with the "gold, silver, precious stone" of the pure, incorruptible, unalterable word of God, he points to the only stable and sufficient foundation of a departing sinner's hope. After the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has been administered to Mr. Lee, together with Mrs. Sutton, Magdalen Fernley, and an old servant,

" 'My dear Mrs. Sutton,' he said, when it was over, 'I cannot thank you or recompense you for all your tender care of an old blind man; but I know what your motive has been, and it is one that has its promise of recompense at the resurrection of the just.'

" 'Oh, sir,' sobbed forth poor Mrs. Sutton; 'oh, that I may be meet to find a place beside you on that day! You have fought your fight, you have finished your course, your reward is sure.'

" 'Christ died for sinners; *that* is my hope, my *only* hope,' said the dying man. 'I count not myself to have apprehended: I dare use no words of confident trusting, but I *hope*: I hope and trust that some lowly place beside my Redeemer's footstool may be found even for me! Yet, blessed be God, I *can* hope; for I look not on what I have done for Him, but on what He hath done for me. That is my consolation; that gives me peace.'

" 'Yes,' said I, 'you now feel the fulfilment of the promise, that they shall be kept in perfect peace whose minds are stayed on Him, *because* they trusted in Him.'

" 'O Lord,' repeated the dying man, in a tone as though his whole soul was concentrated in the prayer, 'O Lord, let thy mercy lighten upon us, as our trust is in Thee! O Lord, in Thee *have* I trusted; let me never be confounded!'

"With this ejaculation on his lips, Mr. Lee sunk back and fainted. For a moment we thought he had expired, but he presently recovered; yet it was evident that the soul was parting from its tabernacle. I believe, however, that an hour or more passed away, in which he seemed to take little notice of any thing. His hands were folded as if in prayer, and occasionally a few faint, undistinguishable words were uttered. The damps of death were on his brow: there were the pinched, sharpened features, the hollow temples, the leaden lips, and all the signs of approaching dissolution; yet there was a calmness and holy joy spread over his features, which seemed already to betoken that the bitterness of death was past. Was the soul too deeply

wrapped in devotion to be conscious of the body's sufferings? or were the sightless eyeballs cheered with beatific visions, and the bright aspects of heavenly visitors? Who can tell?—who has not felt the mysterious influence of the unseen world, as he has watched the advance of that hour,

“ ‘ When good men cease to live?
When, brightening ere it die away,
Mounts up their altar-flame,
Still tending with intenser ray
To heaven, whence first it came.
Say not it dies, that glory :—
‘Tis caught unquench’d on high,
Those saintlike brows so hoary
Shall wear it in the sky.
No smile is like the smile of death,
When all good musings past
Rise wafted with the parting breath,
The sweetest thought, the last.’

“ At length, in a voice which, although feeble, I heard distinctly, Mr. Lee spoke once more. “ Raise me,” he said—he had slid down towards the lower part of the bed, as usually happens under similar circumstances)—‘ raise me; I cannot die so.’ Mrs. Sutton raised him. ‘ Now pray!’

“ I knelt beside him, and said, ‘ God the Father, who hath created thee; God the Son, who hath redeemed thee; God the Holy Ghost, who hath infused his grace into thee; be now and evermore thy defence; assist thee in this thy last trial, and bring thee into the way of everlasting life! Lord, into thy hands we commend the spirit of this thy servant, for Thou hast redeemed him, O Lord, Thou God of truth!’

“ ‘ Yea, faintly murmured the departing saint, ‘ Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!’

“ The silence of a minute or two ensued, and then, after one gentle sigh, his head sunk upon his bosom, and my dear friend entered into his rest.”—(pp. 156—158.)

We have no room for the reflections of the Vicar of Yateshull over the relics of his departed parishioner and friend, but we must refer for these to the volume itself: which, though we cannot recommend it for the family or village library, may be perused by more cautious and experienced readers, certainly not without interest, and perhaps not without profit. We admit with the author, that the character of the true Christian, whose life is holiness and whose end is peace, is formed always on the Bible, and often by the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. But where the Bible is the study, night and day, we cannot bring ourselves to think, with him, that the grace of the Holy Spirit will be wanting, even though the Prayer-book be not its ‘ interpreter and commentary.’ We cordially unite in his eulogy of our admirable liturgy—we accord with his prayer that ‘ God would vouchsafe to continue it in all honour and veneration in the Church for ever’—we desire that it may become the language of Catholic Christianity in the land—that all may be won to its adoption, as a form of sound words, a perfect pattern—so far as aught of man’s preparation *can* be perfect—of social, congregational, universal prayer. But while we unhesitatingly

proclaim ' Salvation in and by the Church of England,' we cannot hold with those who declare, ' and no salvation out of it.' The Apostle rejoiced, when " Christ was preached, whether in pretence or in truth—and herein we do rejoice, yea and will rejoice," so long as the preaching of " Christ crucified is the power of God unto salvation ;" and the conversion of the soul is the act of Him who doth indeed work *in* the Church, but *who can work without it.*

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND. By the Very Rev. RICHARD MURRAY, D.D., Dean of Ardagh. 1840.

IN an age when knowledge is the fashion, and information on all kinds of subjects, from the pyramids of Egypt to a steam-boiler, is quite a popular mania, it is not to be supposed that history is a neglected branch of learning, even though it has been stigmatized, by men high in office, as " an old almanack : " nor, indeed, is it actually overlooked. Family Libraries and Cyclopædias of History are daily endeavouring to enlighten the present race of mankind as to the deeds and fate of their forefathers ; and yet very little is generally known concerning many portions of history which are deeply interesting, both in a religious and political point of view. This deficiency has been seen by the pious and indefatigable Dean of Ardagh, and with a master's hand he has supplied one part of it, in giving us this valuable little sketch of the history of his own beloved Church.

Many points set forth in these " Outlines " are, in truth, unknown to Protestants ; and stoutly denied, or ingeniously misrepresented, by Roman Catholics. Among these, we may especially mention the Eastern origin of the Primitive Irish Church—the anti-Romish principles of St. Patrick—the Scriptural religion and great learning of the Culdees—the introduction of Popery by the Danes—the true history of Irish Church-property—the universality of outward Protestantism in the island during the reign of Elizabeth—and the deep poverty of the Protestant Church in subsequent times. All these facts are clearly exhibited, and fully proved, from authentic historians, and very often elicited out of the mouths of Roman Catholics themselves. It has seldom been our good fortune to meet with so comprehensive and lucid a

history in so small and cheap a form. It supplies the ecclesiastical deficiencies of our usual Irish histories; and it gives us what, in the present day, really deserves the favourite name of a *desideratum*, viz. THE TRUTH. Those who wish to be acquainted with this, as regards "the Catholic Church in Ireland," cannot do better than peruse the work before us; and, in order to justify this opinion, we will now present a sketch of its history, with a few extracts, which will enable our readers to judge for themselves of the simple, manly, and truly Protestant style in which it is written.

Dr. Murray commences by quoting various early testimonies to the existence of a Christian Church in Ireland, long before the Bishop of Rome assumed his unjust power over his brother-prelates. Roman Catholic historians themselves are constrained to allow this, for Dr. O'Halloran says that "a most uncompromising enmity existed in the minds of the Irish people, against everything connected with Rome," (p. 4) even before the arrival of Patrick, or the mission of Palladius; and the same writer admits that the former "found an hierarchy established in Ireland" (p. 8.)

It is a singular feature of the Church of Rome that she invariably either claims or vilifies a distinguished historical character. The good St. Patrick was too firmly rooted in the affections of the Irish to be successfully vilified, and therefore he is always claimed as a Papist. A variety of Irish and other writers are, however, brought forward by Dr. Murray (p. 6. §), in proof of Patrick's non-Romish education, and his Eastern-church principles; as well as those of the early Irish Church in general, grounded upon their anti-popish customs, the marriage and hereditary succession of their priests, the great numbers of their bishops, their Greek mode of keeping Easter, and of using the Liturgy, &c. &c.

The plentiful abuse showered on this venerable Church by Papal writers, is an admirable testimony to the purity of her creed and practice. St. Bernard (quoted p. 22) speaks of the "pernicious custom, which gained strength by a diabolical ambition of some men in power, who possessed themselves of bishoprics by *hereditary succession*—this kind of *execrable succession*—this *wicked and adulterous generation*."

This last phrase refers to the marriage of the Irish priesthood. In truth every practice of the Irish Church seems to have been opposed to those of the Romish; just as we should expect to find it in a hierarchy whose apostolic succession was derived, in a direct line from St. John the Divine. This descent is clearly stated (p. 29); for Ignatius was the disciple of St. John, Polycarp was

taught by Ignatius ; Irenæus and Pothinus were the disciples of Polycarp and the first bishops of Lyons and Vienne, and “ Lupus and German, the descendants of these holy men, ordained St. Patrick, and made him chief bishop of their school among the Irish ; and from St. Patrick to the present day, we have our regular succession of bishops NOT FROM ROME, NOR THROUGH ROME, BUT THROUGH THE SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLE JOHN, THE PATRON OF THE IRISH CHURCH.”—(p. 29.)

The second chapter introduces us to the Culdees, an order of married monks, who worked for their living, and whose rule “ was invented by St. Athanasius, a Greek father, and Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt. Their office was the Greek and not the Roman, and even in their mode of tonsure they differed from similar establishments in the Roman Church.”—(p. 32.)

The glory of this order was the celebrated Columba, or Columbkil, of whom an interesting account is given. The readers of this book, unless they be well versed in early British Church-history, will probably be surprised at the collection of testimonies to the extensive spread of this order ; their anti-Romish practices and doctrines, and their genuine learning and piety.

“ Bede, though sincerely attached to the See of Rome, yet with candour and truth confesses the merits of the Culdees. ‘ Whatever he was himself (speaking of Columba), we know of him for certain, that he left a succession renowned for much continence, the love of God, and regular observance. It is true, they followed uncertain rules in the observation of the great festival, as having none to bring them the Synodal decrees for the keeping of Easter, by reason of their being seated so far from the rest of the world, therefore only practising such works of charity and piety as they could learn from the PROPHEITICAL, EVANGELICAL, and APOSTOLIC WRITINGS.’ ”

Poor Culdees ! they had *only* the Scriptures to direct their course, and were ignorant of the *true* rule of faith, the decrees of Rome. Well does Dr. Murray add, “ their warmest panegyrist could not pronounce a finer eulogium on the purity of their faith, and the integrity of their practice.”

This glorious and venerable body was finally undermined by a mixture of persecution and bribery worthy of the insidious cruelty of Rome. They were totally expelled from their famous seat at Iona (or I-Columbkil), in 717 ; and their power in Ireland was gradually and virtually destroyed by the rapacious encroachments of the Papacy, after the conquest by Henry II. They continued to exist, however, in name, down to the year 1625, and Archbishop Usher mentions their celebrating service “ in our memory.”

The third chapter gives us the history of the Church in Ireland, during the Danish rapines, so fatal to the learning, peace and piety of the Irish colleges, as well as of the people at large. The introduction of the Benedictines by the Danes, in the 10th century, and the long catalogue of Romish knaveries and oppressions, terminating in the entire subjugation of Ireland to England, and of the Irish Church to Rome, present a mournful picture of religious decay and degradation.

The ecclesiastical history of the English conquest is well sketched; impartially displaying the tyranny of Rome, in making over Ireland to Henry, in consequence of the Pope's "DIVINE RIGHT TO ISLANDS, discovered in the prophecies" (p. 69)—the slavish submission and rapacious ambition of Henry himself—and the traitorous compromise of the Irish bishops. The non-compliance of the clergy and people at large is evident, even from Roman Catholic historians; shewing us that then, as now, "there were two CHURCHES IN IRELAND."—(p. 78.)

The next chapter presents us with so admirable a portrait of Rome, as displayed in her dealings with unhappy Ireland, that we will not spoil it by partial quotations, but must refer our readers to the original. The mock-patriotism of the traitor-bishops, unrecompensed and therefore dissatisfied,—the tyranny of their English successors, their excommunications and usurpations,—the oppressed widows, and prisoners "starved to death," for resisting ecclesiastical enormities,—the humble petition of the loyal native Irish, to be received under the protection of Edward I., and allowed the benefit of those English laws, which John had passed a charter to bestow on them, and Henry III. had confirmed, but which the rapacity of the nobles and the tyranny of the bishops virtually abrogated—the king's goodwill towards them—the second and third repetitions of this prayer—and the negligence and selfishness of the hierarchy, which prevented compliance with its petition;—the continued intrusion of Englishmen into the chief sees and other offices—the "vexation" of the Papal Irish, who stood between two fires, English supremacy on the one hand, and native Irish vengeance on the other,—all these render the times from the English Conquest to the reign of Edward II., a deeply interesting period of Irish history.

Both Edward Bruce and Lambert Simnel served for safety-valves to the restless and rebellious spirit of Irish Popery. The coronation of the latter was a piece of treason expressly got up by the bishops, who endeavoured to propitiate the Pope by a handsome subsidy. The attempt was unsuccessful, and the prelatiical rebels were obliged to submit themselves right humbly to the

Pope and the king of England. The conclusion of this chapter contains a fact little known, but which ought to be indelibly impressed on the memory of every English Protestant. This submission of the turbulent prelates was sealed by oaths of the most binding nature, and

“The attempt made to elude the force of these oaths, is a strong instance of that detestable casuistry by which the schoolmen of the Church of Rome have seared the natural susceptibility of conscience. When at length every difficulty appeared to be adjusted, it was demanded by Kildare, the leader of the rebellion, that the host on which they were to be sworn should be consecrated by one of his own chaplains. This demand involved literally a *mystery of iniquity*, which the rude proposer could never have fathomed for himself, and which few Roman Catholic laymen of the present day will be able to comprehend without a particular explanation. It has long been a doctrine of the Papal Church, re-published at Trent under the sanction of a curse upon all who deny it, that the *intention* of the officiating priest is necessary for the validity of a religious rite. The conspirators were assured that the *intention* of Kildare's chaplain would be cordially in their favour; thus the form of consecration would be the juggling illusion of a mountebank; the wafer would be no host; and the protestation made upon it, ‘So help me *this* holy Sacrament of God's body, in form of bread *here present*, to my salvation or damnation,’ however awful in its terms, would have no meaning, and consequently no terrors to those whom the prelates should initiate into so comfortable a secret. But Edgecumbe was aware of the perfidy of the demand; he insisted that the mass should be celebrated by his own chaplain; and has left us a description of the whole ceremony, which shews the appalling character of the meditated prevarication.”

We have seldom seen a finer display of the true Jesuitry of the Papal system than this; and the acuteness of the Popish Sir Richard Edgecumbe, who so adroitly caught the juggling prelates, reminds us of that homely, but very correct saying, “set a thief to catch a thief.”

One remark here forces itself upon us. How often have we been told that Ireland has been, all along, a rebellious province, ever ripe for “treasons, stratagems and spoils,” &c. &c.; but let the page of history shew *who* are the rebels of Ireland. Who were they in the early days of English possession? Were they the native Irish? the disciples of Patrick's Church? the followers of the Culdees? No. The supporters of Edward Bruce were the Papal priesthood; they fomented the insurrection, and they crowned the usurper. Again, when Simnel was also crowned in Dublin, all the bishops (save four) joined his party, and the Bishop of Meath preached his coronation sermon. They went too far for the Pope that time; for England was still under Papal rule, and yielded a better revenue than wretched Ireland, and therefore the four faithful prelates were commanded to excommunicate their brethren, who had allowed private revenge against England to operate against the better interests of “the Holy See.”

The poor persecuted natives humbly petitioned for royal protection, and tendered the humblest fealty to the English monarch; while even the British intruders into Irish bishopricks, animated by the true machinating spirit of Popery, combined to foment rebellion during reign after reign.

The history of the Reformation in Ireland is given in the last chapter, and the submission of "all Ireland" to the Protestant faith is clearly proved, by extracts from Carte, Barrington, Leland, and Phelan.

"Thus the fact of the Reformation having been generally received in Ireland by the nobles, priests and people, seems to be as fully proved as any other in history. The bishops and priests of the Church of Rome all outwardly conformed; they freely substituted the Common-prayer for the missal, and English service for a Latin mass. They could then discover no heresy in our book of prayer, and nothing damnable in our public service: but a new light flashed upon them from Rome, and after many years' conformity, they withdrew from our Church."—(p. 113.)

This light was flashed upon them by those extraordinary beings, the Jesuits; a body who adapted their proceedings to the circumstances of time and place, in a manner that fully justifies that clear saying of the President Dupin—"*Protée n'est qu'une fable; le Jéuitisme est la realité.*"

In Ireland they spread the report of Queen Elizabeth's being deposed and excommunicated; a report which soon became a truth, that sovereign being shortly afterwards as far deposed as a Papal bull could do it. Insurrection, Italian invasion, Papal indulgences, all were skilfully combined to overthrow the Reformation in Ireland; as massacres, oppression, and mis-government have ever since been united against its progress. The prohibition of religious instruction in the native tongue had tended to keep the people in ignorance of the true nature of Protestantism; and they were therefore easily drawn back into the old Popish snare which they had so recently quitted; while the laws forbidding the native dress, and the old custom of wearing long hair, operated as a powerful cause of discontent. Indeed every prejudice of the Irish mind seems to have been treated in such a manner as to make of it an engine against England. Need we then wonder at the darkness which so soon spread again over this unhappy island?

The poverty of the Established Protestant Church, a fruitful cause of religious destitution, is well handled in these pages, and numerous historians are called in to bear witness to this fact. The deplorable state to which the spiritual cures were reduced, in the days of Charles I., chiefly by lay aggressions upon them, may surely be deemed one cause of the awful rebellion of that period.

There was an utter lack of orthodox religious instruction; the people were therefore ready to fall into the snares of Popish priests and agitators; and we have already seen what apt proficient such characters are at the trade of treason.

Nor have things much mended in this respect; the letters of Archbishop Boulter, quoted by Dr. Murray, shew a similar state of church poverty in the early part of the last century; and the celebrated "vote of agistment," passed in 1735, deprived the Irish Establishment of three-fourths of her only support—her tithes. We earnestly recommend such of our readers as wish to become acquainted with the history and true nature of that much-agitated subject, tithes in Ireland, to peruse attentively this portion of Dr. Murray's little work, together with the Appendix, No. 8. It is a question on which so many falsehoods have been unblushingly circulated by the enemies of the Protestant Church, and so many false notions are entertained by her friends, that any writer who will clearly, briefly, and on good authority, represent the truth of the matter, deserves the thanks of the Established Church, not only in Ireland but in England also.

In conclusion, we cordially recommend our readers to avail themselves of the Dean of Ardagh's labours for their information on this little-known portion of Church history, and we trust this work may be useful in producing clearer ideas and more extended knowledge of an important, but much misunderstood and studiously mystified, subject.

We must not omit to commend the able and judicious preface, by that unwearied champion of Irish Protestantism, Charlotte Elizabeth. We will only say, that it is worthy of her former efforts in the cause, which combine the constancy of her own sex with the energy and firmness of the other.

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE, *as exhibited in De Rulhière's Historical Elucidations, and various other Documents.* Compiled, translated and edited by DAVID DUNDAS SCOTT. Small 8vo. Seeley & Burnside, 1840.

NOTICES OF THE REFORMATION IN THE SOUTH-WEST PROVINCES OF FRANCE. By ROBERT FRANCIS JAMESON. Small 8vo. 1839.

CURSORY VIEWS OF THE STATE OF RELIGION IN FRANCE, *occasioned by a Journey in 1837.* By JOHN SHEPPARD. Small 8vo. London. 1838.

WE witness with much satisfaction the growing interest which the modern religious History of France is acquiring in this country. We have long thought that a collection of records relating to the Reformed Churches of France, from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the time of Louis XVI., would form a valuable Appendix to our general Ecclesiastical Histories. It may be very doubtful, however, whether those records, which must often be gathered from the writings of partisans, should be presented to ordinary readers without being accompanied with some account of the authors, their peculiar situations, and the times in which they lived. The omission of this appears to us to be the defect of the work of Mr. Dundas Scott, whose scanty introduction to his principal author, De Rulhière, is more of an essay than an historical elucidation. We are thankful, nevertheless, to Mr. Scott for the new sources of information he has opened on French Protestant History; and his occasional notes show that he is fully qualified, should he continue his labours, to supply the defect of which we complain. If he had introduced De Rulhière to us with somewhat more ceremony we should not have been startled, as we were (and as we imagine most of the readers of the 'Historical Elucidations' will be) at the first sentence. "The pious and benevolent intentions which led Louis XIV. to revoke the Edict of Nantes have been cruelly disappointed, as for the last hundred years has been daily proved." None but a bigotted adherent of the Church of Rome, or a French courtier of the last century, could have penned such a sentence as this; and yet we are left in the dark as to which of the two characters belongs to De Rulhière. The author of the 'Historical Elucidations (eclaircissemens historiques) of the causes of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes,' (whose finished style of writing has elicited the

praises of Voltaire) was originally an officer of the king's guard, and was aide-de-camp of Mareschal De Richelieu; he quitted the military service in 1765, and accompanied the Baron de Bretueil to St. Petersburg: on his return to Paris he was employed by the king to write the history of the troubles of Poland for the use of the Dauphin; and this task he performed with such success, that when his MS. was read at the French Academy, it procured him admission at once as a member of that distinguished institution, and he received from royal munificence the more solid reward of a pension of 6,000 francs, which he enjoyed until the day of his death, the 30th January, 1791. That his moral character was such as to disqualify him from feeling any true Christian sympathy with the persecuted Huguenots, may be inferred from a single witticism of Chamfort—'I never did but one naughty act in my life,' said De Rulhière when some one accused him of loose conduct—'When will it be finished?' was Chamfort's reply.

The author of the 'Historical Elucidations' was in fact a courtier; 'and was employed,' as Mr. Dundas Scott tells us, 'by the government of Louis XVI. shortly before the engrossing events of 1789, to make researches into the laws relating to Protestants.' He undertook this task therefore as a pensioner of the Bourbon family; and although he pleads the cause of the Protestants, and frequently exhibits his marked disapprobation of the policy of Louis XIV., yet one of his main objects is to show that this monarch is scarcely to be held responsible for an act, committed under his supreme authority, perhaps the most wantonly cruel of any that ever disgraced even the annals of the French nation. Bishop Burnet was travelling in France at the period of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and he has preserved in his narrative some affecting accounts of the martyrs who suffered under 'the pious and benevolent intention of Louis XIV.' It is supposed that nearly 50,000 emigrated to our shores; and such was the sympathy excited in this country on behalf of the unfortunate exiles, that King James granted briefs for collections in our churches for their relief. Before Mr. Scott selects his materials for another volume of records, we recommend him to consult Quick's Synodicon, and he will see how the several steps of that 'presumed system,' which De Rulhière very politely declines to attribute to the 'openness' of the kings of France, are traced out, and how Louis XIV. fell in with the views of the Popish clergy. It is indeed very probable that he was not aware of the well-concerted scheme for the suppression of the Reformation in France, which had been so successful in Italy; but as often as Le Tellier (who succeeded the Father la Chaise in the office of Regal Confessor) repeated 'that Protestant-

ism was extinct in France,' the sentence was not ungrateful to the ears of the 'grand monarch.' The apologists of Louis XIV., amongst whom we must be permitted to class De Rulhière, would represent him as altogether averse to the persecutions inflicted on the Reformers: 'he was led by their zeal for conversion, against his inclination and his principles, into an intolerance from whose rigour he at first revolted!' Father la Chaise and Madame de Maintenon are supposed to have inspired this 'good-natured monarch' with such a zeal for making converts, that he agreed to the summary mode which they proposed of accomplishing conversions; others again would represent the act of revocation of 1685 as entirely political; they accuse the Huguenots of 'attempts to gain an ascendancy; and of aiming at a political rather than a religious distinction: it was necessary, they say, to destroy their fortress of La Rochelle, and deprive them of their power, (amounting to an *imperium in imperio*) in other places of France;' but to such arguments we reply, that it was not necessary to deprive them of the rights which had been solemnly granted and enjoyed by them for eighty-five years, and which were purely of the nature of a religious liberty. The documents collected by Mr. Scott will be found of the greatest interest in elucidating these points, and we think will bring his readers generally to the conclusion that the act of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was the result of a deeply-laid scheme for the total suppression of the Reformation in France.

Mr. Jameson, who has given us a very interesting volume of 'Notices of the Reformation in the South-west Provinces of France,' says—'The Romanists do not conceal that it was the fixed purpose of those two monarchs (viz. Louis XIV. and his predecessor) to destroy Protestantism, and that all their declarations of protection and advantage were only held out to keep their victims in a steady posture on the block till the moment for execution came.' This system was steadily pursued for eighty-five years; but whether the two monarchs had any fixed purpose of their own, or were the mere tools of the Romish hierarchy, can only be known by a closer investigation of that portion of French history than has yet been attempted. We do not mean to insinuate that Mr. Dundas Scott differs from us in opinion as to the systematic suppression of the Reformation in France: from the few observations he has inserted at the bottom of his pages we gather something of his own view on this matter; but we put this point prominently forward to show the necessity of not allowing such apologists as De Rulhière to appear before the public without proper credentials; for we have no notion of that sickly sentiment, technically called a charitable construction put upon men's actions,

which would excuse the atrocities of a monarch, now generally allowed to have been a tyrant, upon the ground that his intentions were good, and that he was led to mistake religious persecution for political authority. 'The king,' says De Rulhière, 'found himself engaged in a persecution repugnant at once to his natural good sense and to his whole character !' When the author of the 'Historical Elucidations,' who is continually reminding us of the pensioned Court Tutor, by such sentences as the foregoing, is properly understood, his *eclaircissemens* may be read with much interest, and will elucidate the history of the French persecution. The melancholy results of the act of Louis XIV. have been nowhere more faithfully described than by this same De Rulhière. 'The king,' said Madame de Maintenon, 'is highly pleased at having completed the grand work of reuniting the heretics to the church.' Father la Chaise and M. de Louvois promised that it would not cost a drop of blood. 'The event showed,' adds De Rulhière, 'what the promise was worth, and we might add, what a high satisfaction the king's 'magnanimous spirit' (p. 167) must have experienced at the completion of such a work.'

"We shall not here recal that disastrous emigration which during seventy years never stopped, but which even now (1789) is ever ready to begin anew. We stop not to inquire how many thousands of men, women, and children perished amid the dangers and fatigues to which they were exposed in endeavouring to escape. We shall only say with Boulainvilliers, though far from being an exact author, that ten thousand men fell victims to fire, the wheel, and the gibbet. And, to quote more authentic testimonies, we have just seen that Noailles reckoned that there were 240,000 Calvinists in the province of Languedoc alone; while Bâville, fifteen years after, does not make that unhappy race amount to more than 198,000, and yet the troubles of the Cévennes had not yet commenced."—(pp. 167—168.)

Mr. Jameson's work is confined chiefly to the local history of Bearn, and we think he has employed his leisure time during his winter residence at Pau to great advantage. The sources from which he has derived his knowledge of the portion of history on which he professes to treat, are not to be found in every library; and the personages whose memoirs he relates may be considered as among the most important in the annals of French Protestantism. The character of Jeanne D'Albret, and her strong attachment to the reformed faith, are ably delineated in the former chapter of Mr. Jameson's work; and we imagine none of our countrymen who resort to Pau for a winter residence, will go without Mr. Jameson's little work, which will add an interest to the chateau of Henri IV. and the beautiful scenery of that once flourishing district.

The religious condition of France since the last revolution has engaged the attention of many benevolent persons in this country.

The vigour which has been infused into the Protestant institutions, especially the Academy of Montauban—the zeal which has been displayed in the formation of several societies for promoting the doctrines of the Reformation—the surprising number of Protestants, (amounting, it is supposed, to 1,200,000)—the revival of pastoral conferences, preparatory to a Synod, and the yearly increase of congregations in places where none have previously existed—all these things have awakened in the minds of several of our zealous countrymen great expectations of some important change in the religious condition of France. A Society, which is designed to unite and consolidate the various schemes and somewhat desultory attempts of our good propagandists, has just been formed, under the title of the ‘ Foreign Aid Society ;’ its object being, as we find from the prospectus, to collect funds in this country for the purpose of aiding the orthodox Protestants in France to promote the religious principles of the Reformation. It may be sometimes difficult to ascertain whether a Frenchman, calling himself a Protestant, be an orthodox believer or not ; for as there is no confession of faith, or any other standard of doctrine to resort to, nothing less than a personal knowledge of individuals can in the present state of things be satisfactory. We must be careful, however, how we draw our conclusion from such superficial remarks as are contained in the journal of Mr. Sheppard, who appears to think that a conversation with a fellow-traveller in a diligence, or on a steam-boat, may give a very fair notion of ‘ the state of religion in France.’ For our part, we shall never think any scheme that may be formed for spreading, or rather reviving the principles of the Protestant Reformation on the Continent, established on a solid footing, until the few men who are Christians in faith, and prove it by their practice, apply themselves to obtain these two essential elements of a visible Church—a properly ordained ministry, and an accredited confession of faith. Meanwhile, we are glad to see religious tourists, like Mr. Sheppard, taking notice of the present state of things ; and we have no objection to that unlimited zeal which attaches importance to the dropping of a religious tract, or to ‘ a word in season’ at a Table d’Hôte ; for amongst a people so utterly regardless of all serious religion, if such tourists do no good, they can scarcely do much harm. We look forward, however, to some more effectual mode of bringing our French neighbours to a rational and scriptural view of Christianity. In the mean time we have yet much to learn of the past and present religious condition of France, and shall be glad to see a continuation of Mr. Scott’s historical researches.

A CHARGE, *delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Surrey*, by SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, M.A. at his Primary Visitation, in September and October; and published at their request. *Burns.* 1840.

WE do not propose, under ordinary circumstances, to devote any considerable portion of our pages to works which are, from their very nature and object, of local or partial or temporary interest. Such must always be the case in regard to episcopal, decanal, or archidiaconal charges, which have, or at least ought to have, a primary, if not an exclusive reference to the special concerns and exigencies of the district or the diocese over which the Author may preside. We now deviate, however, from our prescribed rule, thus early, for two reasons; first, that the publication before us touches a most important subject, which we trust the Author will be induced to prosecute at greater length and into more minute detail hereafter—the exercise “of the dormant powers with which the system of the church is instinct for the healing of the age;” and secondly, because no work can be otherwise than of universal interest to the christian world, to which is prefixed the name of WILBERFORCE.

Of that ‘clarum et venerabile nomen’ the charge before us is not unworthy, whether we look to the modest and unassuming, yet by no means undignified manner, in which the Archdeacon of Surrey introduces himself, in his new character, to the notice of the assembled clergy; or to the view which he has formed of the spiritual functions and responsibilities attaching to his important and responsible office; or above all to the solicitude which he manifests to obtain the fraternal sympathy and co-operation of those among whom he is to take the delegated oversight, not as “having dominion over their faith,” or about to exercise a vexatious and inquisitorial scrutiny over their proceedings, but as “a fellow-helper in the truth—a fellow-labourer in Christ Jesus.” The recognition of Christian brotherhood between the different orders and offices of the ministry, not only in mere expressions of compliment and courtesy, which are often as unmeaning if not as insincere as the designation of the self-styled Vicar of Christ, “*Servus Servorum Dei*”—but in the detail and practice of the pastoral office, in its manifold and complicated anxieties, perplexities, and difficulties, has long been a thing much to be desired in the Anglican Church. It is most needful, and would surely be most beneficial, that the parochial clergy in general—but more especially

those of the younger clergy, who do not enjoy the benefit to be derived from the presence and counsel of a resident Incumbent, but are left, without experience and without assistance, to sustain the grave responsibility of a parish—should have an adviser to whom they may apply, in cases of necessity, not only by sufferance but of right; one whose experience would inform their ignorance, and whose authority might embolden them in duty—one who should reside within such a distance, and possess so far the control over his own time, that he might, in all extreme exigencies, undertake to visit, admonish, strengthen, or direct—supply what was wanting, correct what was erroneous, or sanction what was right—perform in fact all those functions, which are so explicitly enjoined in the “*Reformatio Legum*,” in a passage which the Archdeacon has thought fit to quote—but not to translate. A literal translation, indeed, would suggest what is the real state of the case;—that the Archidiaconate is among the first official recognitions of that pernicious principle, which has been in every age as much a “*scabies ecclesiæ*” as the “*disputandi pruritus*” itself—viz. that spiritual functions are capable of being discharged by proxy. It is true that the usefulness, the necessity of the Archdeacon’s office cannot but be admitted in the present state of the church; when, to use Mr. Wilberforce’s forcible expression, ‘a whole ocean of human life is pent up within the limits of our straitest diocese.’ But the very expression “*Sint itaque oculi episcopi*,” “Let the Bishop use the Archdeacon as his eye,” will at least suggest the question whether it would not be more in accordance with the constitution of the primitive church, and more consonant with true apostolicity, if the extent or the population of dioceses were so apportioned, that the Bishop could use his own?

But—

A substitute shines brightly as a king
Unless a king be by;

and we will admit, that functions which cannot be performed by Bishops in person will be much better delegated to an efficient representative, than not performed at all—nay, we will go farther, and acknowledge that, in the present state of the church, and assuming that a return to the episcopacy of apostolic times is altogether out of the question (though we may find somewhat to observe on this subject hereafter), the substitution may operate advantageously to the interests of religion, and to the comfort of the clergy. The interval between the bishop and those who “*in functionibus sunt inferioribus*” is too great to admit either of frequent or unreserved communication; and the Archdeacon might be, if he were so disposed, a connecting link between the two extremes—the Alpha and

Omega of our ecclesiastical polity—the Curate with one hundred pounds per annum, and the Bishop with ten thousand. But here, as in manifold other instances, that which was most excellent in principle has been marred and mutilated by laxity in practice. It was, in days of which the memory is still recent and vivid, no very uncommon circumstance to find the same individual Archdeacon in one diocese, Prebendary in another, Chancellor in a third, Incumbent in a fourth or fifth—the archdeaconry being generally the most scantily-endowed of all these preferments, and the functions of it, in consequence, most cursorily and superficially discharged. The ‘usual duties of an archdeacon’ have too frequently consisted of travelling once a year from the other extremity of the kingdom—delivering in some half-dozen places a charge treating of subjects generally rather than locally important,—presiding at as many dinners, for the honour of partaking which the country curate sacrifices no inconsiderable fraction of his quarterly stipend, and then laying aside all of the archdeacon except the title, until the next annual round of charges, dinners, compliments, and solicitations to print what is never intended to be read. Happily, that abuse is now in a great measure obviated—all recent appointments have evinced that the Bishops have at last become alive to the absurdity of having an ‘eye’ out of the diocese—the late bill, whatever may be its demerits and defects, has removed one great inducement to the pernicious practice of pluralities, by making provision for the better sustentation of this dignity—and when the office is filled by such men as Archdeacon Wilberforce promises to be, and as some are, whom it would be invidious to name,—nothing would be left us to regret, but that we could not change the designation rather than the functions, and give each Bishop as many Suffragans in his diocese as he now enumerates Archdeacons. In speaking of pluralities, however, let us not be misunderstood. We do not see any objection to an Archdeacon (and the same remark would apply to a Suffragan) holding a parochial charge within the limits of his own appointed sphere of duty, whether episcopal or archidiaconal. It would indeed rather afford him facilities for shewing himself to be an example to the flock. That to which we *do* object, is the accumulation of duties upon those who have no power and can have no intention to discharge them; a practice which exalts the individual, by debasing the office, to the detriment, the disparagement, and the dishonour of the church. We know, indeed, the reasoning by which Paley, with his wonted ingenuity, has attempted to justify the practice. ‘Rich and splendid situations in the church have been justly regarded as lures, held out to invite persons of good hopes and ingenuous attainments.’ But the riches and the

splendour of these situations is not the principal feature in the argument, which might be correct enough, if it applied to sinecures alone; to many of these "splendid situations" important duties are attached, which will derive no efficiency in their performance from the 'good hopes' of family preferment, or even of the ancestral estates and titles in reversion; nor yet the 'ingenuous attainments' of much Greek and Latin, much natural and moral philosophy, much antiquarian and patristical lore. Every Archdeacon ought to be, what we believe Archdeacon Wilberforce is, a man skilled and practised in PASTORAL theology: one who has 'used the office' of a presbyter 'well, and thus purchased to himself a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.' To such men we should be glad to see allotted, in every diocese, a canonry to sustain their dignity, and a parochial charge, to exercise and exemplify their personal energies. Archdeacon Wilberforce, we observe, has resigned his living in the Isle of Wight—we hope this is only a preliminary step to his replacement in the superintendence of a parish within the limits of his own archdeaconry,* believing, as we do, that he would be an example to the shepherds as well as to the flock, 'in word, in wisdom, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity.'

We ground this opinion not on any personal knowledge of the individual, nor yet on the probable transmission of what is oftentimes hereditary virtue, but on the tone and tenor of the charge itself, in which it is quite clear that the Author has taken a just and candid view of the chief obstacle which presents itself to the efficient and adequate operation of the mighty influence for good which lies torpid and dormant in the church.

"Perhaps one of the main causes of want of strength within the church of England, at this time, is the want of concert, combination, and therefore of strict union between her clergy. We act separately in our parishes—we grow to act as units on society: the man, therefore, and not the system, is brought to bear upon the various hindrances we meet with. Meanwhile, the necessary love of our own plans—peculiar modes of viewing truth—the apparently paramount importance of that part of the truth which we are most apt to contemplate; all this tends to develop a selfish standard, to lower our estimate of unity, and to sever us from our brethren. Then come suspicious thoughts of all who do but express the same truth in different modes of speech; then shyness of combined action, which is soon observed, imitated, and exaggerated by our flocks; and so the compact phalanx of the church, which in her union would be "terrible as an army with banners," is broken up into a mixed and disordered multitude, and is in danger of becoming the helpless prey of the first vigorous and combined assault of her beleaguering enemies."—(p. 9.)

One method of removing this obstacle presents itself, naturally enough, in the endeavour to infuse life and vigour into the archi-

* We have observed, since this was written, the announcement of Archdeacon Wilberforce's appointment to the living of Alverstoke.

diaconal office ; to make it what it ought to be, in accordance with the design of its primary institution ; not merely to maintain, on its present footing, the annual visitation, and this ' not for form alone, but for mutual exhortation, counsel or encouragement ;' but to combine with it a parochial visitation, which shall render the Archdeacon personally acquainted with every parish within the visit of his jurisdiction. Another, which he reserves to the close, as being most deeply important, concerns the whole body of the clergy ; for whom, as he justly observes, ' it is of no use to rail against the spirit of the times in which God has cast their lot ; their business is to mould and sanctify it, and this they may do, if they bring the influence of the church to bear upon it.' There is so much of godly sincerity, combined with practical wisdom and profound knowledge of mankind, in a passage which developes the true remedy for the most glaring and portentous of our existing social evils, that we cannot forbear to cite the entire paragraph, which contains grave matter of deliberation, not only for every clergyman, but for every attached and conscientious member of the church of England.

" At this moment two causes mainly lie at the root of all those convulsions by which the peace and order of society are threatened—the unequal distribution of property, and the want of a common bond of unity. Now both of these undoubtedly are the result of a highly unnatural and, in many respects, diseased state of society ; and the craving for their redress is not in itself evil. It becomes evil only when it seeks the mocking, selfish world as its redressor ; instead of seeking, as it ought to, the power of Christ's church.

" For, take for a moment the second of these causes : is it not true that there is a great and widening separation in this land between the various classes of society, and even between man and man ? Thus the bonds which of old held the high and low of English society together are melting away. Where, for instance, amongst our vast manufacturing population, are the old bonds of mutual affection and respect—of rational care on the one side, and generous trust upon the other—by which the peasantry and gentry were united ? And this poison cannot be anywhere present in the circulation of the body politic, without reaching, more or less, to every part—it creeps on to the trading classes, to the shopkeeping classes, and thence even to rural districts. This change is passing upon the very conditions of social life in England ; and at the same moment, and from the action of the same causes, the straiter bonds of family life and subjection are wearing out ; children are becoming more independent, and brethren therefore more disunited. And yet men are so constituted as to crave after union and co-operation : in the bitterness of spirit, therefore, which waits on this increasing separation, they look around for some new bonds which may replace the old. It seems to them that religion has been hitherto one of their dividers ; for they have known her only in the multitude of sects ; and so they turn from her, and vainly hope to find in common interests, and the jugglery of sensual promises, a cement strong enough to hold together their pretended social system. Now, how are such men to be met ? Not by railing against their desire of combination, for this rests on a true longing of man's heart—it is the cry of their souls against the misery around them ; but by shewing them that the church is this healer of division ; that in her unity, and in it alone, the selfish, jarring hearts of men may be indeed charmed to concord. My reverend brethren,

there is at this moment a special call upon us to believe and act upon this truth ; to proclaim it fearlessly, that division is not of Christ ; to teach in all our parishes, and carry out the truth in all our plans, that in the church is the secret of unity for which men's hearts are thirsting. What were it not to do for England, to bring these healing powers to bear upon our torn and disaffected multitudes ; to bring our great cities, with all their busy swarming life, to bow down in the fellowship of a true faith before the altar of a common Redeemer."—(pp. 33—85.)

To the sentiments and convictions thus expressed, we subscribe from the ground of the heart. But, instead of proceeding with the Archdeacon to the second of these causes, any comment upon which would carry us far beyond our limits, we will add a few remarks in reference to the first. We have always believed—and our conviction is daily gaining strength by experience—that the great instrument of moral regeneration to the country will be unity of action in the church. It is not only "to bow down in the fellowship of a true faith before the altar of a common Redeemer," but to mingle in the intercourse of ordinary life with that faith working by love. Unity of profession, unity of worship, unity of faith, must be conducive to, and confirmed by, unity of practice, unity of object, unity of charity. Not content with professing, the laity must combine and co-operate in the endeavour to diffuse, church principles ; and in order to effect this, they must be associated with the clergy not only in church ordinances, but in what we must designate, for want of a more popular and authorized term, church practices. There must be something like an allotment or distribution of labour among those who are really members of the Church ; partakers of both her sacraments ; and whatever benefit may be derived from the Archdeacon's annual visitation in stirring up the efforts of the clergy, assuredly a corresponding and equal benefit might be realized by the parochial minister, in a monthly convening of those who were at once qualified and willing to be, practically, his "fellow-helpers in Christ Jesus." For example, in this charge the Archdeacon has commented severally, and in all cases most judiciously, on various topics, all interesting and important at the present crisis, such as the levying of church rates—the assessment of tithes, or the commuted rent-charge, to the poor-rate—the Bishop of London's proposal for providing bishops for the colonies—and the importance of seconding the operations of the Diocesan Boards of Education. Applying the same principle to a parochial clergyman at his monthly visitation of lay-churchmen, who does not see that facilities would be thus afforded for stirring up their zeal and directing their exertions, whether towards objects of general interest, such as the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, or its sister Institution for promoting

Christian Knowledge, or the National Society for the Education of the Poor, or the establishment of Episcopacy abroad; or to concerns of local usefulness—the Dispensary—the Savings' Bank—or the School—the condition of the poor, social, moral, spiritual, and the best means of improving it; the extension of the means of Christian worship, or the removal of any obstacles which may be presented to its exercise. We can see no greater risk of any interference with, or encroachments, on the special functions of the clergy arising out of associations such as this, than that any clergyman should avail himself of Mr. Wilberforce's request for mutual counsel and encouragement to usurp the peculiar province and functions of the Archdeacon; nay, if possible, less—inasmuch as the distinction between laic and cleric is broad, clear, marked, distinct—each member in the body of Christ has not the less his own place and office, because we are members of one another. The unity after which the whole church “groaneth and travaileth until now,” and which Archdeacon Wilberforce is so laudably solicitous to promote, demands not only an active body of clergy, but an active body of laity—in co-operation with, yet in subordination to, those who, in spiritual things, are over them in the Lord. If Christ's Church is to teach the rich man that he is “God's almoner,” she must teach him how to minister of his abundance—if she is to instruct the poor man, that he is “God's pensioner,” she must shew him from whom he is to receive, and on what terms, the benevolence of God. And this is not only to “claim and to receive those full offerings with which the church ought to equalize the inequalities of poverty and wealth”—our work is but half done, unless we can make him who is the donor in some degree the distributor and dispenser of them also—unless we can interest him personally in the work of Christian sympathy and brotherhood—unless we can persuade him to give *himself*, as well as his *substance*, to the Lord. We advocate no other lay interference, than that which the apostle himself recognized when writing to the church, “whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality into Jerusalem;” and again, when he exhorted Timothy to “charge them that are rich in this world, that they be glad to distribute, willing to communicate”—words which surely imply, beyond all possibility of misconception, that the act of communicating and of distributing was their own. We propose to resume this train of thought, however, at no distant period, in treating upon the important subject of Pastoral Theology. Meantime we cannot conclude this article more appropriately, than with the closing words of the charge itself, an expression of Christian solicitude in which we most cordially join; and which we trust will be answered

by increased zeal in the clergy, augmented prosperity to the church, and to the respected Author himself, in the consciousness that he hath not laboured in vain.

“ A great work doubtless, my reverend brethren, is before us. Let us, therefore, be men of labour; seen and known in a perpetual ministry as the messengers of peace. We need for its fulfilment an earnest faith and great and constant self-denial. Let us, then, for the sake of others, as well as of ourselves, be men of holiness. Let us seek for the rich indwelling of the Spirit of all grace. For without this all our labours are in vain; our costliest efforts are an empty stage-shew—there is no life in them, and in performance they must fail, as lacking reality and truth. Above all, let us be men of prayer—of prayer for ourselves, as those who, beyond all others, need wisdom, strength, and mercy; wisdom to thread harmlessly our often doubtful way; strength to bear a burden always too heavy for us; mercy, for more than others, and in greater things, we oftener fail; of prayer for others, for we are appointed to be intercessors, and where we can do no more, we can always pray, and prayer cannot be in vain. In one word, ‘seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, let us faint not.’ ”—(pp. 37, 38.)

SHORT NOTICES.

THE WHOLE WORKS OF RICHARD GRAVES, D.D., *late Dean of Ardagh, &c. &c.; with a Memoir of his Life and Writings, by his SON.* In four volumes. Dublin. 1840.

THE plan of this publication precludes us from entering into any detailed analysis of the excellent and most instructive work before us, embodying as it does several of the most valuable Theological Treatises of the age, on which the seal of public approval has been already set, never, we apprehend, to be obliterated. The *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, and *Scriptural proofs of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, are held in the highest estimation by those who are most competent to appreciate their value; and will never, probably, be omitted in any complete list of a Theological Library. While the Sermons, in the concluding volume, will be read with peculiar interest, exhibiting, as they do, the Professor of Divinity in the less prominent, but not less honourable character, of the Pastor of a congregation; in the one character manifesting profundity of learning, in the other using great “plainness of speech;” and whether he speaks, *ex cathedra*, in the Schools of the Prophets, or from the parochial pulpit, as the servant of a Master who preached the Gospel to the poor, alike rightly dividing the word of truth, and seeking not his own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved.

We shall not, in saying this, be understood to accord with every sentiment which may be expressed either in the Academical Prolections or in the Parochial Discourses of the Dean of Ardagh. But our high estimate of his theological attainments has been, if possible, enhanced by those developments of his personal habits and private meditations which are furnished in the very interesting Memoir,—the most appropriate and the most enduring monument which could be reared to a beloved Parent by a dutious and devoted Son. With all deduction that can reasonably be made for the natural and excusable partiality of filial affection, it is quite clear that the Dean of Ardagh was not only one of the most distinguished of scholars, but one of the most amiable of men; that he was actuated by that “brotherly kindness” which could only have been caught from the constraining influence of the love of Christ—and that, in a sphere of much theological controversy, and at a time of much political contention, he was, what the Spirit of God alone could have made him, habitually mindful of the work of the ministry, and devoted to its supreme object, the winning of souls. He did not merge the Pastor in the Professor. We find him quitting the academic audience and the seat of Moses to gather around him the little ones of Christ’s flock—exchanging the authority of Gamaliel for the affectionate simplicity of a teacher of babes, and alternating between the extremes of human intellect, as one who could fathom the deepest yet despised not the shallowest; only desiring for both, that they should be consecrated to God.

We will not attempt any analysis of this interesting biography, nor will we exhibit detached portions of that which ought rather to be contemplated as a whole. We will trust ourselves only with a single example, of the crowning grace, humility.

After a long and active life, of which forty years had been passed in the discharge of the most important and laborious functions, to the perfect satisfaction of every one but himself, “I remember,” writes a friend and pupil, “that we rode out together, and he appeared low in spirits, and the conversation turned upon some of the subjects on which he had written. He spoke so disparagingly of himself, that I could not help observing, that I hoped he had done much good by his publications. I cannot forget the *humble sigh* with which he said, ‘Ah! I have not done near as much as I ought to have done—I have done nothing!’”

Not long after this, on the 29th of March, 1829, he entered into his rest, at the age of sixty-five years. We know not whether a monument has been erected to his memory—but he lives in the portraiture of his mind.

**A VERBAL PARAPHRASE on *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*.
By the Rev. E. BOSANQUET. London: *Burns*. 1840.**

THE Epistle to the Romans is a part of God's Holy Word, the worth of which can scarcely be rated too high. It is a more full and complete unfolding of the great doctrines of the gospel than is to be found in other parts of Scripture. Addressed to the metropolis of the world, the Spirit of God seems to have chosen to expound here, with more than usual fulness, the great message of salvation, which is finally to subdue the rebellious nations to the obedience of Christ. No part of Scripture has been more fruitful in doctrinal and practical expositions, or has contributed in larger measure to the edification and comfort of the Church of God. Every work devoted to its explanation has therefore a deep interest from its subject alone, whatever may be the degree of its intrinsic merit.

The present volume contains the English text, with a not very copious paraphrase—marginal comments, in part extracted from the Fathers, and partly containing the author's own remarks—an introductory note, chiefly taken from Bull's '*Harmonia Apostolica*,' with a very brief analysis of the Epistle at the close, and some short concluding observations. Its object is not practical; and even the doctrinal views of the author appear to be rather asserted by implication, than fully discussed or maintained by distinct argument. We hope then that some work on the same Epistle, more full and solid, may shortly supply us with a more worthy occasion for a full review, and shall pass by this paraphrase with only a few remarks.

First, the school to which the author belongs may be seen by the extract quoted from Bishop Bull at the opening, with approbation, and by his own observations which follow, in these words:—

"If such then be the case, it may in conclusion be remarked, that one, perhaps the most common and most influential, cause of the misapprehension and perversion of the apostle's writings exists, in the fact that many are in the habit of reading them as if addressed to ourselves in our present state, instead of searching after the mind and objects of St. Paul as regards those in circumstances so totally different, whom he was actually addressing. From whence it naturally follows that new and unscriptural meanings must be invented for expressions originally referring to those of the apostolic age, in order to render them specifically applicable to ourselves; and thus it is, for example, that the word '*elect*,' which then distinguished the members of the Church of Christ from those yet heathens, is now interpreted as distinguishing one Christian from another: and the '*conversion*' from idolatry and sin of the heathen proselyte, into the necessity of some such change in one who from his childhood has been, and has walked as became, the baptismally-adopted child of God. And thus what might and oftentimes

would be correct if used analogically, by being twisted into a literal application is made to lead us from, not to, the apostle."—(p. viii.)

We cannot but regard the school of theology to which such sentiments belong as very superficial and injurious. Doubtless, in every part of God's Holy Word, it is desirable to pay attention to the temporary occasion of the writing, and the character of those to whom it is directly addressed. But to make its interpretation mainly or solely dependent on those circumstances, and explain away and soften down its truly Catholic adaptation to the common state of man's fallen nature in every age, is, in our view, a most pernicious error, and detracts greatly from the Divine glory of the sacred oracles. The main topics of this Epistle—man's sin and corruption; the authority of the law, its power to condemn, and powerlessness to justify; salvation by faith in Christ without works of law; the freedom of grace; the need of holiness; the inward work of the Spirit; the sureness of God's covenant to them that believe—these are not truths of a day, and their application to professing Christians is as full and strong as to Jews and heathens in the times of the Apostle. In fact, the scope of the remarks just quoted is directly opposed to the spirit of St. Peter's caution. It is making the Epistle 'of private interpretation;' that is, dependent for its right acceptation on passing and temporary events, rather than on that self-knowledge which goes down into the depths of the heart, and that heavenly wisdom which diligently compares Scripture with Scripture, and thus enters into the wide range and glorious fulness of God's counsel of love.

There are several statements in the marginal notes that would serve to confirm the impression drawn from those which have just been quoted. Thus, on chap. v. we have a painful specimen of a gloss on Scripture, almost if not altogether contradictory to the text. The inspired Apostle there lays down the clear and simple truth, that the Christian is 'justified by faith;' but the illustration, as the Author entitles it, asserts that man's first justification is 'by baptism,' and his final justification by 'walking worthy of his vocation.' Now it is remarkable that the Spirit of God in this Epistle does not so much as allude to baptism, till the topic of justification has been closed, and the subject of Christian holiness begins. The note of our author is indeed perilously near the edge of the Apostle's warning against those who preach 'another gospel.'

With this short notice we take our leave of this Paraphrase for the present. If some treatise of deeper and wider interest should recal our attention to the subject, we may perhaps then find occasion for more extended remarks. But the Epistle itself forms too

important a pillar of the Churchman's faith, and of sound theology in general, to warrant us in a light or cursory discussion of its real scope and meaning. Those readers whose object is some information upon the expositions of the Fathers, will find in the work a partial assistance; but we cannot speak highly of its general tone, or praise it as forming any solid accession to our stock of sound divinity. The short preface of Luther to this Epistle embodies more deep, close, experimental truth, than all the notes and paraphrase of our author.

THE MINISTRY OF ANGELS : *A Seatonian Poem.* By the Rev. THOMAS E. HANKINSON, M.A., of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. J. and J. Deighton. 1840.

THIS is indeed an extraordinary Poem to have been dignified with the academic laurel. In saying this, however, we are far from implying, that it is not worthy of the distinction conferred. So far otherwise, indeed, that had we ourselves been among the arbiters, we should have concurred most heartily in the award, however strange it may appear to critics of the rule and compass, who decide upon the merits of a poem, not from the presence of beauties, but from the absence of faults; and who would blot out the blessed Sun from the canopy of heaven, because there are a few spots upon his disc.

That Mr. Hankinson's poem on the Ministry of Angels is altogether free from *maculæ* we do not venture to pronounce. Among many exquisite images we have detected an occasional extravagance, and among many admirable verses a few indifferent rhymes. Powers are developed, however, which, if the Author does not add to the fire and exuberance of genius an equal portion of its characteristic irregularity and indolence (of which we are not without our fears,) might raise him to a far higher rank among the Poets of his native country, than he can hope to achieve by carrying off every Seatonian Prize until he becomes an octagenarian. We are bound, however, to give proof of our assertion, and we will do so by stringing together a chaplet of gems, which we might almost challenge any modern poem of equal dimensions to parallel, much less to outshine :—

THE CREATION.

“ Far away through ether ran,
The rumour, ‘ Let us fashion man.’
In widening circles of sweet sound,
It swept Heaven's infinite profound,

*Like a summer wave, whose motion
Heaves, but does not break the ocean.*

It is the hush of expectation
That stops the pulses of creation.
He touched the dew-drop, as it hung,
And startled, as it burst from sight;
Half fearful of inflicted wrong
Upon the tiny globe of light.

Where shall we find a lovelier sketch of Evening in four lines than the following :

When sweet and slumbrous melodies,
O'er land and water creep;
As Nature sits, with half-shut eyes,
Singing herself to sleep.

We wish we could afford space for the noble description of the witness borne by inanimate Nature to the attributes of Deity (page 14.) We recollect nothing finer in the whole compass of Sacred Poetry.

But where is the marvel, our readers will ask, that such a poem should bear away the classic wreath of Granta. Because Mr. Hankinson degenerates into doggrel when he tells us, that

“ With toilsome steps, through paths of *danger*.
I have wooed the Rover's wild delight;
Hunting for scenes of beauty and *grandeur*,
And spell-bound as they rose to sight.”

And when the Angels promise Ada that they will club together to make him a parasol—

“ When fiery noon comes down, *embrowning*
The slippery turf beneath the trees,
Our wings shall interweave an *awning*
Of cooler shade than these.”

In like manner we have for rhymes, *heard*, and *cord*; *hung* and *wrong*; *pressed* and *wrist*; blemishes which would, in other days, have sufficed to condemn a whole tome of poetry, had it even excelled Southey and equalled Byron or Campbell. Mr. Hankinson must not carry his license beyond this; and even this, we imagine, would have proved fatal to his pretensions, had not some of the Examiners been animated by a portion of the celestial fire that burns in the bosom of the bard, and perhaps justified their decision by the precedent of Pindar—

“ Humeris que fectur
Lege solutes.”

We think, however, we could ensure Mr. Hankinson not only the Seatonian succession, but a conspicuous niche in the Temple of the Britannic Muses, if he would only write such poems on such subjects, and assign to us plodding and pains-taking critics the office of correcting him.

THE BETTER PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH. *A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Lewes.* By JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A. London: J. W. Parker, 1840.

THIS Charge is a singularly original, a highly talented, and a somewhat eccentric production; original in its views of Church prospects; talented, in its description of Church evils; and eccentric if not whimsical, in its contrivance of Church remedies. We think there is much which deserves the most serious consideration in the suggestion of Archdeacon Hare, that "the charity, which confines our bounty to our own parishes, is after all little better than a secondary selfishness, which is ashamed of its own deformity, and therefore puts on a mask;" and that it is more peculiarly in aiding those who have no claim upon us beyond our charity and their own necessities, that the ties of Church-membership and brotherhood in Christ are both demonstrated and confirmed. Still, it must not be forgotten, that while a man is to care for his own—those of a common profession and a common creed—he is to cherish and to manifest a special concern for those of his own house; and that we must centralize, before we can communicate, the benefits of a universal Church. We shall rejoice, if under his Archidiaconal superintendence, a district which needs comparatively little is enabled to impart much; and the diocese of Chichester shall take the lead in the honourable work of raising contributions for the spiritual necessities of others, which are not absorbed in providing for its own.

We cordially acquiesce, further, in that proposal of the Archdeacon's (we wish our acquiescence were contagious) which, without any tedious or expensive alteration of Church fabrics, would at once double the amount of Church accommodation. We allude to the removal of "those eye-sores, and heart-sores, pews; and substituting open benches with backs in their stead." This would, however, cause a revolution in the Church-frequenting world, which will probably be preceded in the political world by universal suffrage; and, were it too abruptly and precipitately attempted, would operate as a premium upon dissent, and raise the value of pewed chapels in the market by at least fifty per cent. It is too true, that "the tendency of pews is to destroy the character of social worship:" but it is equally true, that the existence of pews is but one among many evils, all springing from a root of bitterness which is beyond all human power to eradicate—and, to be consistent, if we banish pews from the area of our Churches, we

must level the tombstones, in their cemeteries, and deface the monuments upon their walls. If death will claim its heraldry of the "stored cenotaph and sculptured urn," the cross bones or the grinning skeleton, how are we to abolish these vain distinctions in life? It is to be more than feared that considerations of architectural beauty and proportion will avail but little with the haughty, the luxurious, the fastidious, and the somnolent, even though they are urged by the Archdeacon in his own forcible but somewhat too familiar manner. We cannot help observing, that there is too much of the grotesque in his very lively description of this offence against good taste. "When one enters a Church on a week-day, and sees the strange fashion in which the floor is partitioned out into large shelfless lidless boxes, one is involuntarily reminded of one of the ugliest objects on the face of the earth, Smithfield market when empty." Now, we have been for many years resident in the very heart and centre of the great European Babylon—we have traversed Smithfield market quite as frequently, and gone into as many Churches as most of our contemporaries—and yet, such is our obtuseness of perception, that this involuntary association never occurred to us, till we met with it—where we did not expect to meet, and do not think we ought to have met, with such a comparison—in the Primary Charge of an Archdeacon delivered in a distant county. Our own venerable Archdeacon, who holds his visitation in the Church contiguous to the market, and whose Charges, octogenarian as he is, combine all the energy of youth with all the wisdom and experience of hoary hairs, will not, we venture to hope, adopt this similitude—lest the parallel should be carried one degree farther—to *Smithfield market when full*. Associations are awkward things—like the profane jest which old Fuller heard in youth and remembered to advanced years—they adhere to the memory long after better things have been forgotten.

Of the same character, though not quite so ludicrous and therefore not quite so objectionable, are the Archdeacon's strictures on windows spoilt by the substitution of paltry wooden frames for the original stone mullions and tracery, which are sometimes so mean, that nobody who cares how things look would allow them to be seen about his own house, unless perchance in the "*stable*." We wish that the clergy of the Archdeaconry, upon whose ears these expressions must have grated, had suggested that they should be expunged before the publication of the Charge. Our own association upon reading them was one which we fear would not be very satisfactory to the Archdeacon:—

He, that negotiates between God and man
As God's ambassador, the grand concerns

Of judgment and of mercy, should beware
 Of lightness in his speech.
 So did not Paul . . . He would not stoop
 To conquer those by jocular exploits
 Whom truth and soberness assailed in vain !

We have been thus minute in our strictures, because this is the first instance of flippancy, of irreverent and unseemly coarseness, which in this age of novelties has encountered us in so grave a production as an Archdeacon's Charge—and we earnestly wish it may be the last. Mr. Hare may easily be imitated in the familiarity, if not in the aptness, of his illustrations ; and who shall presume to censure the jocular Divine, who does but follow the precedent of the officer who is the “ Bishop's Eye ?” If however we were to quote all the passages in this Charge which are worthy to be eulogized for felicity of illustration, soundness of argument, acuteness of penetration, animated exhortation to labours more abundant, and affectionate earnestness of brotherly love, we should leave little of the Charge still untransferred to our pages. We have noted its defects ; but *he* must read it, and carefully too, from the beginning to the end, who would justly appreciate its merits, and fully enjoy its beauties.

One thing we cannot comprehend. “ A principle,” says Archdeacon Hare, “ is the source and fountain-head of rules.” He is speaking of national policy, but the remark is equally applicable to national language ; and we should be glad to know, what is the principle and what are the rules of his very fanciful orthography ? We meet, in this Charge, a whole phalanx of friendly participles, our old acquaintances in a new dress. *Wisht, releast, admonisht, worshipt, checkt, and percht*. If this were the principle of abbreviation, the exclusion of superfluous letters, we could understand, though we might not approve, or assent to it—but, if so, why are the syllables gratuitously lengthened in *errour, torpours, fulfill, controul* ? &c. To apply one of the Archdeacon's own similitudes, is not this to “ improve Shakespeare by whitewashing him, and getting rid of whatever is most characteristic ?” Mr. Hare may be assured, that he will find it much more easy to abolish pews throughout the diocese of Chichester, though in so doing he must cleanse the Augean stable of long accumulated prejudices, than to remodel the orthography of Scott, Southey, Mackintosh, and Hallam !

POEMS BY THE LADY FLORA HASTINGS. Edited by her
SISTER. Edinburgh: *Blackwood and Sons*.

WHATEVER might have been the intrinsic merits or demerits of this volume, the circumstances under which it is presented to the public would almost appear to have silenced the voice of criticism. Censure, however merited, would have been like the exhumation by Rome of some of the relics of our sainted, though uncanonized, reformers, whom she could not pardon because they had gone down to the grave in peace; and what can the value of the critic's approving suffrages, when its object is beyond the reach of human praise? We have only by examining this volume learnt that of which the knowledge can avail us nothing, that the talents of Lady Flora Hastings were little inferior to her virtues; and the wreath of fame which she would assuredly have attained, had she been spared to realise the promise of this her first and only production,—

“Is hung upon her hearse to droop and wither there.”

There is, we acknowledge, considerable inequality in the various pieces which compose the volume, but this may be readily accounted for—they were produced at different periods, and few, if any of them, received the final revision of the authoress. Instead, however, of indicating blemishes, for the correction of which there is now, alas! no scope, we would rather point to the more graceful and poetic portion of the volume, and particularly to the exquisite poem of the ‘Dying Sibyl,’ in which there are not only lines of classic stateliness and melodious cadence—images and illustrations of peculiar aptitude and beauty, but entire stanzas, which no poet of the present day need blush to acknowledge for his own. We select, for example, several of the last:—

“Why art thou fear'd, O gentle death? Thy wing
Unheard, now soars above, and fans my brow.
Was it to chide me for my lingering,
I heard thy voice so silver-toned e'en now?
I will not linger—farewell Earth—I go
Fearlessly following on, as led by thee
Mysterious angel! Yet fain would I know
If I must perish all? all? aye, and be
The thing which once I was—Insensibility.

“There is a voice, soft-breathing—still it floats,
In tones most musical it meets mine ear:
List, ardent spirit, list—those airy notes
Are whispering that a brighter world is near.
Where does there aught remain to waken fear?
Chaotic darkness shall not be my fate—

Annihilation shall not be my share—
 Angels of hope and peace! I see ye wait
 On me;—the white-robed heralds of a loftier-state.

“O yes! I felt it was not made for earth,
 This chainless essence—this unfathomed soul;
 O yes! I know some future second birth
 Will bid it rise, and soar beyond control.
 Roll on, ye circling spheres! exulting roll—
 Yet know ye have a period—ye must shroud
 Your brightness, and desert the starry pole,
 While I, unbound, by mortal thrall unbowed,
 Shall find a home—*my* home—ecstatically proud.

“My home—no more an exile—Oh how blest
 Beyond conception—day that knows no night—
 Land of pure rapture—world of endless rest!
 I come—a heavenward voice directs my flight,
 Vanish, terrestrial visions, from my sight!
 Burst, earthly bonds, that hold me from the sky;
 Merge, heaven-born spirit, in the flood of light
 Furling thy pinions there, while He on high,
 Thy God, shall crown thy brows with immortality!”

We regret that we have no space for some of the minor occasional pieces, which breathe a spirit of deep devotion and earnest piety. We have said enough, however, to recommend the book, even if it were not already recommended by the holy purpose to which the profits of the volume are consecrated. This will be best announced in the words of the accomplished editress, the Lady Sophia Hastings, who, in thus perpetuating the memory of their sisterly love, seems, indeed, to have felt that

“The last charge, by friendship given,
 Is hallowed as a voice from heaven.”

“When I recal all that occurred while I was in attendance on her death-bed, there is that which makes me feel solemnly bound in the sight of God to fulfil her wish, and to lay the offering of her poetical talents on the altar of her Maker, as she would fearless herself have done. It is under the influence of this feeling that I now send forth to the public this volume; the profits of which will be applied to aid in the erection of a chapel or school in the parish of Loudoun, as an evidence of her gratitude to Almighty God, and her good will to her fellow-creatures.”

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

MARCH, 1841.

SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES, *as applicable to Religious Societies.* By WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D., Vicar of Leeds. London: 1841.

Two phrases of the most ambiguous character, but capable of being used, and adopted in order to be used, as party watch-words, have lately been brought into fashion. Of one of these,—“Church Principles,”—we have already spoken; and it will now be our endeavour, fairly, but unreservedly, to examine into both the real and the conventional meaning of the other.

The necessity for such a discussion is clearly forced upon us. The aggressive movement is already made; and made by those whom we feel to have no substantial ground for the attack which they are leading. Meetings are being held in various parts of the country, at which “Church Unions” are formed, and resolutions entered into for the support of what are called “*The Church Societies.*” And if any explanation be asked, as to *which Societies* are thus designated, the reply is *always* in the same tenor,—“The Christian Knowledge Society; the Gospel Propagation Society; the National Society; the Incorporated Church Building Society; the Additional Curates’ Society.” These, and these alone, are allowed to bear the name. Divers others, consisting either solely or chiefly of churchmen, and presided over by bishops of the Church, are thus virtually excommunicated. Among these we may name, the Church Missionary Society, with *twelve* prelates at its head; the Church Pastoral Aid, with *ten*; the Prayer Book and Homily Society, with *four*; and the Naval

and Military Bible Society, over which preside their Graces the Lord Archbishops of Canterbury and of York!

All these, by the invidious claim set up by the associated five, or rather, set up on their behalf,—of being “*the Church Societies*,” are virtually consigned into the class of irregular or schismatical associations, with which any churchman of a doubtful or sensitive conscience will take care to have nothing to do.

Such being the existing state of things, we are greatly indebted to Dr. Hook for manfully venturing into print, and affording us something wherewith we may grapple, in an earnest wish to understand, and to form a correct judgment on, this interesting question. We have carefully read the Doctor's tract, and find in it the strongest confirmation of our previous apprehensions. A more singularly inconsecutive argument we have never happened to encounter; and the natural effect upon the mind is, a conviction that if even the Vicar of Leeds can make out no better case than this, the cause which he has taken in hand must surely be a most indefensible one.

Happy should we be, did our limits allow us to transfer the whole of Dr. Hook's argument into our own pages. As this, however, is not practicable, we shall endeavour to select the leading points of his statement; and to show, by the most simple and notorious facts, against what precedents and authorities he is vainly contending.

We begin with the Doctor's first positive conclusion. He says:—

“Here, then, we find our first principle. An institution worthy of a churchman's support should be *confined exclusively to members of the Church*. This may sound illiberal. That is no business of mine. I simply state what is scriptural.”—(p. 9.)

This is a very off-hand way of settling the question: “I simply state what is scriptural.” Aye, but, good Dr. Hook, you have not taken the trouble to *prove* that it *is* scriptural. You have, indeed, quoted two or three texts, such as, “*A man that is an HERETIC, after the first and second admonition, reject:*” but in what way these establish the doctrine, that “an institution worthy of a churchman's support should be confined exclusively to members of the Church,”—you have not even so much as endeavoured to show us.

Nay, more, your own practice considerably *qualifies*, if it does not entirely destroy, your own argument. Within these few weeks a meeting was called in the town of Leeds, to take measures for the relief of the poor. And there stood, in his proper place, the Vicar of the parish, surrounded and aided by, and acting in close

and intimate concert with, a host of Independents, Quakers, and Socinians! There may, then, it seems, be *some* institutions “worthy of a churchman’s support,” which are *not* “confined exclusively to members of the Church.”

But it is immediately rejoined, that a distinction is to be drawn between societies for religious objects, and those for merely secular purposes. We *might* answer, that charity is a religious object; as much so as teaching the poor to read. But we readily admit the existence of a shade of difference between the two cases, and claim only to draw *this* deduction from the fact which we have stated:—The Vicar of Leeds does not refuse to associate with schismatics or even with heretics, when he finds that he can do so without the compromise of any religious principle. His theory, as we have above quoted it, is stern and unbending; but his practice admits the entrance of distinctions, and the possibility of exceptions to the rule.

Now a great number of the members of the Church, and even of the clergy of that Church—nay, *even his own diocesan*—carry this admitted principle of possible exceptions one step further than Dr. Hook chooses to do. Having seen, with him, that it may be right to associate with schismatics in works of charity, they have applied this rule of exception to one of the greatest acts of charity that can be named—the giving the word of God to the poor. Having a plan set before them, by which, without compromising any one principle of the Church, they can assist in a great effort to disperse the Gospel over all lands, they have consented, upon this common ground, and without so much as touching upon any controverted topic, to unite with believers of every denomination in this one simple and yet all-important work. This has been done, in the last forty years, by at least from twenty to thirty Bishops of our Church. It passes only by one single and narrow step, the recent public act of Dr. Hook himself. But it is utterly at variance with his “first principle,”—that “an institution worthy of a churchman’s support should be confined *exclusively* to members of the Church.”

Let us apply the same principle to another class of institutions, our Parochial Schools. In the metropolis, in which this is written and published, we have probably two hundred of these institutions, all of them carried on under the parochial incumbent’s eye, and giving a purely Church education. But, has ever such a fancy entered any one’s head, as to “confine” these “exclusively to members of the Church?”

They are generally “parochial” schools. The support of *all* the parishioners is distinctly asked, and ordinarily obtained. The

subscribers, in most cases, partake, without restriction, in the management. Socinians, Baptists, and Quakers, often contribute to their support, attend meetings and committees of the subscribers, and speak and vote like other members. No one ever thinks of refusing their aid, or of excluding them from the work. The security of the institution is found in its fundamental rules. Dissenters are aware of these; are aware that they concede much in joining in such a work;—but if *they* can overlook this obstacle, for the sake of the work, it would be strange indeed if churchmen refused to accept their aid, or affixed upon them a badge of contumelious exclusion.

But we pass on to Dr. Hook's second point. He thus states it :—

“ But now comes another question. Admitting that we are to unite for religious purposes with churchmen only,—are laymen by themselves, or laymen assisted by Deacons and Presbyters, competent to organise a religious society? And on the authority of the text before quoted, ‘ Obey them that rule over you,’ we give our answer *in the negative*.”—(p. 9.)

The drift of all this we can perfectly understand. Every one who is at all conversant with the religious history of the last seven years, will perceive at once that it is framed for the purpose of illegitimatising, by an *ex-post-facto* law, the *Church Pastoral Aid Society*.

But is Dr. Hook not aware, or is he regardless of the fact, that his canon smites with an equal anathema both the Pastoral Aid Society and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge? Can he be ignorant of, or has he forgotten, the history of the formation of this last-named institution? The official statement, published by the society itself, informs us, that “ it took its rise from a very small beginning; ”—“ *a few private gentlemen* of the Church of England, about the year 1699, met together to consult upon methods for promoting the real and practical knowledge of true religion.” In another account we are told, that they “ met together to pray, sing psalms, and read the Holy Scriptures; and to reprove, exhort, and edify one another by their religious conferences.” *

Such was the origin of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Dr. Hook tells us that laymen only, or laymen acting with Presbyters and Deacons, “ are *not competent* to organise a religious society.” We have seen that the Christian Knowledge Society *was* so organised. But, further, Dr. Hook tells us, that “ in deciding whether a society is conducted on Church principles,” we

* “ Letter from a Resident Member of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1714.”

must ask, “whether the society places the diocesan in his right position?” Let us try the Christian Knowledge Society by this rule.

According to Dr. Hook, no society “instituted for general purposes” can be considered a *Church Society*, except placed “under the superintendence of the “Archbishops and all the Bishops.”

Now in the *Standing Orders* of the Christian Knowledge Society, of the date of 1722, we find these provisos:—

“Before any person be admitted a member, he who proposes him shall assure the society of his being *well affected to his Majesty King George, and his Government*”* (i.e. that he was a Whig). “But where any Bishop of the Church of England is proposed, he” (having been made a Bishop by the said Whig Government) “*MAY be chosen a member without any such enquiry.*”

A Bishop, then, *might* be admitted, or might be rejected,—the vote being by ballot: such was the standing assigned to the prelates, at the commencement of the Christian Knowledge Society! In fact, both of this, and of the sister society,—that for the Propagation of the Gospel, it may be enough to say, that while Dr. Hook requires, to make a *Church* society, the countenance of both the Archbishops and all the Bishops,—neither of these “venerable societies” enjoyed this amount of episcopal patronage,—indispensable as it is now alleged to be,—for many years after their formation.

So much of the affirmative side of the question. Let us now take a different view, and ask, How does Dr. Hook justify his own standing and course of action?

He professes a strict adherence to the rules ascribed to Ignatius, which author he thus quotes:—

“‘Let no one,’ says Ignatius, ‘do any of the things pertaining to the Church *separately from the Bishops.*’ ‘Let Presbyters and Deacons,’ say the Apostolical Canons, ‘attempt nothing *without the Bishop’s allowance*, for it is he to whom the Lord’s people are committed.’ ‘Some,’ says Ignatius, ‘call him Bishop, and yet do all things without him; but these seem not to me to have a good conscience, but rather to be hypocrites and scorners.’”

These doctrines Dr. Hook appears to adopt; but how does his

* The fervent Whiggism of the founders of this society is very conspicuous. In one of their early publications we find them recommending a *Declaration* to be signed by all masters and mistresses of schools, “That they do heartily acknowledge his majesty King George to be the *only lawful and rightful King* of these realms; and will to the utmost of their power, educate the children committed to their charge in a true sense of their duty to him, as such. That they will not, by words or actions, do anything to *lessen their esteem of the present government.*” And in another, “That they possess the minds of the children with a just sense of the duty and *affection they owe the present government*, and the succession in the Protestant line; and with a just dread of the persecutions and cruelties to be expected from a Popish government.”

practice consist with his professions? His own diocesan, the Bishop of Ripon, gives his cordial support and patronage to the Church Pastoral Aid Society. The prelate of the adjoining see, the Bishop of Chester, does the same. Yet Dr. Hook, in the full knowledge of these facts—in the knowledge, too, that his Bishop had so distinctly declared his judgment as to have preached the last anniversary sermon of that society,—Dr. Hook calls a meeting of clergy and laity at Leeds, and there arraigns his own Bishop of heterodoxy, by formally arguing, before some twenty or thirty of his diocesan's clergy, that the Pastoral Aid Society, which his Bishop patronises, is “*not a Church Society* ;” is “*a society from which we ought to withhold our support !*” And, not content with this, he calls in the aid of Dr. Molesworth, one of the Bishop of Chester's clergy, to assist him in the pious work of destroying, in the minds of all these clergymen, all respect to the judgment of both their diocesans ! “*Let no one do anything,*” says Ignatius, “*separately from the Bishop.*” That is my doctrine, says Dr. Hook ;—but I see no objection to holding a public meeting in my parish, for the purpose of proving *him* to be wrong, and *myself* to be right, in the question of what is or is not, a Church Society.

But Dr. Hook has provided himself with a defence as to this obvious inconsistency. Here is the sophism by which he hopes to escape from this manifest dilemma :—

“*But Bishops are only like ourselves, fallible men ; and therefore we are not to suppose that the converse of this proposition must be true,—that because no society, except such as has the diocesan at its head, can be worthy of a churchman's support ; therefore every society which has a diocesan's sanction must have a claim upon each inhabitant of that diocese. The Church defers to her Bishops as the executive power, but she does not regard them as irresponsible, or infallible, or despotic. She does not intend that they should transgress scripture, and lord it over God's heritage. To them, as well as to us, the principles of the Church are to be a guide, and they, like ourselves, may err occasionally in the application of those principles. And in deciding whether a society is conducted on Church principles, it is not to the diocesan, but to the society itself, that we are to refer. And the question is not merely whether the diocesan belongs to it, but also whether the society places the diocesan in his right position. We are to vindicate the rights of the diocesan, even though the diocesan himself neglect them ; for these rights pertain not to him personally, but to the Church. We are, therefore, to ascertain whether he is recognised by the society as the diocesan—as the spiritual ruler, presiding of right over the society—so recognised as that if he refused to sanction its proceedings it would retire from the field—whether it receives him out of deference to his spiritual character, or only out of respect for temporal rank, where, as in this country, temporal rank, a circumstance of minor consideration, not indeed worthy of notice—is conceded to him. If the society does not do this, it is not one whit improved, so far as its constitution is concerned, though a diocesan may peradventure be one of its members. Here, then, we come to another principle, and we may sum up what has been said, by asserting that a religious society, conducted on strictly Church principles,*

should consist of churchmen only, and should be under the superintendence, if instituted for general purposes, of the Archbishops, and all the Bishops of both provinces of the Church of England; if for diocesan purposes, of the diocesan; if for parochial purposes, of the parochial clergy, who act as the Bishop's delegates.”—(pp. 11, 12.)

Never was any theory more obviously framed to serve a purpose! Dr. Hook entitles his tract, “ Scriptural Principles;” and as one of these *scriptural* principles, he declares the necessity, to form a Church Society, of the entire concurrence of “ the Archbishops and *all* the Bishops of both provinces.” A *single* objector among the prelates would take any society out of his rule, and make it “ no Church Society.” Yet the Society for Propagating the Gospel, at its first formation, had not the patronage of *one-half* of the bench of Bishops. Nor, in forty years after, had it the countenance of the entire Bench. As to the Christian Knowledge Society, we have already seen, that, instead of “ placing the diocesan in his right position,” the by-laws of that society only provided that a Bishop MIGHT be elected, IF proposed, without making the declaration required of other persons, of loyalty and whiggism.

But what is most extraordinary in the whole affair, is the excessive extent to which the right of *private judgment* is carried, by such reasoners as Dr. Hook and Dr. Molesworth. They first appear to lay down a principle, that “ nothing is to be done without the Bishop.” We meet them on their own grounds, and say, Come, then, and support the Pastoral Aid Society and the Church Missionary Society, both of which are approved and recommended by *your own* diocesans, the Bishops of Ripon and Chester.

But no, says Dr. Hook, “ Bishops are only like ourselves, fallible men, and may err occasionally.”

Granted, good Doctor, but then what becomes of your principle, “ Do nothing without the Bishop?” Who is to be the *judge*, whether you, Drs. Hook and Molesworth, or your spiritual Fathers in God, and seniors in the Church, the Bishops of Ripon and Chester,—are in the wrong?

“ WE ourselves,” answers Dr. Hook. “ In deciding whether a society is conducted on Church principles, it is *not* to the diocesan, but to the society itself, that WE are to refer.”—(p. 11.)

To the society *itself*? Is it meant that you are to ask the Pastoral Aid Society, for instance, whether or not it is a Church Society, and to be governed by its reply?

Of course not. But where, then, is the judge, where is the arbiter, by whom the question of churchmanship is to be decided?

It is *not* to be the diocesan; it is *not* to be the society itself. Who, then, is it to be?

It is to be Dr. Hook himself. This is the real drift of his pamphlet. "It is not to the diocesan, but to the society itself that *we* are to refer. And the question is not merely whether the diocesan belongs to it, but also whether the society places the diocesan in his right position. *We* are to vindicate the rights of the diocesan, even though the diocesan himself neglect them," &c. —(p. 12.)

But by what rule, by what standard, are we to judge when it is that "the diocesan neglects his own rights?" The Bishop's own opinion is set aside; the opinion of the society itself (which is in dispute) of course goes for nothing; and the Church, in her Articles and Canons, is wholly silent. Where, then, is the rule, the law, the standard, by which the right and wrong between Dr. Hook and the Bishop of Ripon,—between Dr. Molesworth and the Bishop of Chester,—is to be ascertained? Clearly, nowhere but in Dr. Hook's own *private judgment*; his own individual opinion. "It is not to the diocesan, but to the society itself that *we* are to refer. The question is not merely whether the diocesan belongs to it, but also whether the society places the diocesan in his right position." (That is, in what *we* choose to call 'his right position.') "*We* are to vindicate the rights of the diocesan, even though the diocesan himself neglect them." (Of course '*we*' must be better judges of what the diocesan's rights are, than the diocesan himself.) If this is not precisely after Ignatius's description of certain persons "who *call* him Bishop, and yet do all things without him," then words have lost their meaning.

But who invested Dr. Hook with this authority, to make laws for Bishops and Archbishops? Laws, too, far more stringent and intolerant than the Church ever did, or ever *could*, make for herself. He himself admits, that if the Church were in more happy circumstances, all these questions would be decided in Convocation. In Convocation, then, would the question be debated,—whether such a society—the Church Missionary, for instance, or the Church Pastoral Aid—should be recognised as an organ of the Church of England. But to carry the affirmative, not the votes of "both the Archbishops and all the Bishops" would be needed; a bare majority would be enough. Nor would a majority of the whole episcopal Bench be required; the larger half of those *present* would suffice. Eight prelates, out of fifteen present, or ten out of nineteen, would fully carry the recognition. How monstrous, then, for any single incumbent to erect himself into a national synod, or even more; and to pronounce, *ex cathedra*, that not even twenty prelates con-

cunning could make a society a Church Society ;—when the Convocation, if it met to-morrow, would admit any society to that rank, which could gain the votes of the larger proportion of the prelates who happened to be in attendance.

We repudiate Dr. Hook's canons, then, because they are solely *his own*, and have not a shadow of support, either from scripture or the Church. To call it a "*Scriptural* principle" that a society is not a *Church* Society, except both the Archbishops are at its head,—when Scripture knows nothing of such an officer as an Archbishop,—is obviously absurd. The most offensive point, however, in Dr. Hook's system is, that it broadly and unreservedly censures all that the Church and her prelates have been doing for the last hundred and thirty years. Only carry out, in strictness, his three canons, and the result is, that there is not, never was, and probably never will be, a "Church Society;" but that our prelates have been encouraging and supporting institutions from which "churchmen *ought* to have withheld their support." Let us specify an instance or two of this kind.

We find among the supporters of the *Naval and Military Bible Society*, both the English Archbishops. So far all is well, and according to Dr. Hook's rule. But if we look a little further we find that "the society" does not "place these prelates in a right position." The Patron of the Society is a *layman*. The President is also a *layman*. Descending to the *Vice*-Presidents, we find, first, the two Archbishops, then, nine lay Peers, and then, four Bishops, and *only* four! Clearly, therefore, their Graces of Canterbury and York fall under Dr. Hook's censure. The society is *not* "a Church Society;" it is one "from which we *ought* to withhold our support." We must vindicate the rights of our Archbishops, "even though those prelates themselves *neglect* them."

But we may take another case. Here is the Report of the *Society for the Conversion of the Negro Slaves in the British West Indies*, for 1827 (the last which has fallen into our hands). In it we find that the Bishop of London is "President;" that the Bishops of Durham, Llandaff, Jamaica, and Barbadoes are "Vice-Presidents;" and that the Bishops of Winchester, Chester, and Chichester are "Governors." Very probably other names may have been added since 1827, but we have not seen a later Report; nor would subsequent improvements alter Dr. Hook's censure of the acts of that year. According to his system, he must maintain that these Bishops,—aye, even Dr. Van Mildert himself, that rigid churchman, who was among their number,—were all guilty of a violation of "Church principles,"—establishing a fresh precedent of an institution countenanced by neither of the Primates,

nor by even one-half of the episcopal bench:—a society which “cannot be called a Church Society,” and which yet has eight prelates at its head!

But we may pass on to higher authorities than these. The *Society for Propagating the Gospel*—were these “Church principles” of Dr. Hook’s known or regarded in its formation?

Not in the least? In the year 1701 the Sovereign issues his charter, constituting *eleven* only of the prelates of the Church, together with a number of laymen whose names are given, a Society for the purposes therein described. By this charter, under which the society still exists and acts, the members are enjoined to meet on a certain day in every year, then to *elect* a president. Not the least obligation is imposed, of electing an Archbishop or Bishop, or any other clerical person. A layman is as eligible for the office as the Primate himself. Lord Melbourne or Lord Ellenborough or Sir John Hobhouse might be made President this very next year. That the choice generally falls on the Archbishop of Canterbury is a circumstance arising out of the mere will of the individual members for the time being, and not at all from any law or original proviso of the society’s constitution. The prelates of the Church are *admitted* by election, not assigned a place at the head of the institution as matter of right. The *Collection of Papers*, printed by the society in 1706, states that since the formation of the society the following Bishops had been *elected* members:—Durham, Winchester, Llandaff, Exeter, Sarum, Lichfield, Norwich, Peterborough, Bristol, Lincoln, and Oxford. At least four, then, and probably a larger number, of the prelates of the Church, were not even members of the society, and the like deficiency existed for many years after. This society, therefore, utterly fails to answer Dr. Hook’s requirements. It was *not* placed “under the superintendence of the Archbishops and all the Bishops of both provinces of the Church of England;” nor did it “place the diocesans in their right position,” inasmuch as it left them to be admitted or rejected, by the votes of a mixed body of clergy and laity.

And precisely the same censure might be passed on the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*. This society was, perhaps, more irregular than any other known institution of a similar class, in its original formation. We have seen that it arose from a meeting of certain *laymen*, who assembled for the purpose of praying, singing psalms, and exhorting each other. We may add, that in this society, as in the last-named, a Bishop was only *admitted* on the formal proposition of two members, and by the ordeal of the *ballot*. And, what is still worse, up to 1813, at least, and proba-

bly still later, it was not even needful to be a member of the Church of England, to become one of this society! In its papers published in that year, the form of declaration to be made by the persons proposing a new member, only alleged him to be “*well-affected to the Church of England*,”—a description which would have admitted Matthew Henry, Doddridge, and half the Wesleyans of the present day!

But we cannot agree thus to condemn all that the Church has been doing, from 1701 downwards, merely to enable a few heated controversialists of the present day to excommunicate the Church Missionary and Church Pastoral Aid Societies. Dr. Hook’s canons are inadmissible. We must cease from judging and anathematizing one another, and fall back upon the apostolic rule:—“One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike: Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.” Neither Dr. Hook, nor any other Presbyter of our Church, has any authority to impose laws upon our consciences, which he cannot shew to us, *clearly written down*, either in Scripture or in the standards of our Church. The latter, as Dr. Hook by his omission of all reference to them confesses, are silent upon the present subject. The former, from which, indeed, Dr. Hook professes to educe his “principles,”—will no more support his conclusions, than they would support Popery itself. “*A man that is an HERETIC, after the first and second admonition, reject.*” This injunction, addressed by St. Paul to a Bishop, is seriously referred to, by Dr. Hook, to prove that we, who are not Bishops, ought to “reject” from our religious societies the aid of those who are *not* heretics; who hold the same creeds with ourselves; and who are, as Mr. Gladstone confesses, scarcely to be called schismatics.* With all our respect for the Vicar of Leeds, we must place this arbitrary citing of Scripture among those “wrestings,” and “private interpretations,” against which we are cautioned. Some better reasoning, some clearer command from God’s word, must be advanced, before we can give up that “liberty” which the great Apostle so repeatedly enjoins us to retain.

* Gladstone’s “*Church Principles*,” p. 422.

THE PRINCIPLES OF POPULATION, *and their Connection with Human Happiness.* By ARCHIBALD ALISON, F.R.S.E., Advocate, Sheriff of Lanarkshire, &c. Two vols. 8vo. Edinburgh: Blackwood. 1840.

THIS is a very good book, with a most mistaken and misleading title. Never, in fact, was there a more complete misnomer. We have a collection of Essays, many of them quite masterly both in style and reasoning, on a variety of subjects. Here is one on the *Corn Laws*; one on *Poor Laws*; one on *Church Establishments*. On these, and on several other subjects, the Author is nervous, clear, and entirely satisfactory. The subject on which he throws least light is that of POPULATION!

His book is an unanswerable proof of the inapplicability of the Horatian rule to *all* cases. Had the book been published when it was written (1828) it would not only have been a valuable contribution to the philanthropic literature of the day, but would have taken far higher rank for originality and truth than can now be assigned to it. Little as it does to settle the *then* obscure subject of "the Principles of Population," it would still, at the above date, have been among the most respectable attempts extant, even in that line. Had it then appeared, it might have claimed at least a share in the destruction of the atrocious system of Malthus.* But its Author fell into the error of imagining that the world would stand still while his "nine years" term was being fulfilled; and his book now comes before the public under the vast disadvantage, so far as its professed object is concerned, of having been far more than anticipated by the profound and conclusive treatise of Mr. Sadler.

We regret that Mr. Alison did not, in this view, give his collection a more appropriate name, and one which might not so directly invite a comparison with Mr. Sadler's work. Under the more accurate designation of "Essays on the State and Prospects of Society," or of some title similarly general, the book could not have failed to command attention—to command it in a degree much beyond that which is likely to be excited by so repulsive, and at the same time so incorrect a description as is given by the present title-page. Considering its real value, and the important

* Atrocious, and nothing less than atrocious, we must ever maintain that system to be, which maintains, that "a youth of eighteen would be as completely justified in indulging the sexual passion with every object capable of exciting it, as in following indiscriminately every impulse of his benevolence."

discussions on many topics which it contains, we much regret this error.

We would not, however, be supposed to assert, that Mr. Alison has produced nothing of value on that topic which stands in front of, and gives its name to, his work. He had attentively studied, and carefully considered, Mr. Malthus's system, and had worked out for himself a very sufficient refutation. Had he published these volumes, as he ought to have done, in 1828, he might have reasonably claimed some share in the extirpation of that mischief which in 1828 was so rife, but in 1840 had become utterly extinct—the current belief in Malthusianism. He now can only aim his arrows at a fallen foe. Mr. Malthus's tomes have been already consigned to the stalls and the trunk-makers; and we read Mr. Alison's strictures more for the sake of their own ingenuity, than as being any longer required for the destruction of that most pernicious heresy. Yet there are in his pages some facts of so striking a character as to deserve the widest possible circulation. One or two such we will now give.

The fundamental error upon which Mr. Malthus raised his system was a groundless hypothesis—that the natural growth of population led to a doubling of numbers every twenty or twenty-five years, while a similar doubling of food was impossible. From this parent fiction he deduced the appalling consequences,—that a scarcity of food was inevitable,—was near at hand: and that the chief object with legislators and philanthropists ought to be, to check human increase as far as possible, so as to stave off, as long as we might, that fearful juncture which seemed to be inevitable; when human beings, for lack of other food, would be reduced to feed upon each other!

This monstrous nightmare arose, like all similar fancies of the modern school of political economy, out of a wilful, a purposed ignorance and negligence of plain and obvious facts. Mr. Alison acts like a man of common sense; and beginning, most rationally, with his own country, in a very few moments lays Mr. Malthus's whole system in ten thousand fragments, destroyed so utterly as to leave not the slightest hope of its reconstruction. Never was plain fact and unanswerable reasoning more triumphant over vague and shadowy speculation than in the following passage:—

“ If, in order to test the comparative powers of population and production, it is allowable to put the physically possible, but highly improbable, and morally impossible event of an old state like the British empire doubling in numbers every five-and-twenty years, it is of course necessary to suppose on the other side the equally physically possible, but morally improbable, event of the whole resources of the country being applied during the same period to the production of subsistence. Now, if that were done, there cannot be

the shadow of a doubt, that the island could, in the space of five or ten years, be made to maintain double its present number of inhabitants. It is stated by Mr. Cowling, whose accuracy on this subject is well known, and his statement is adopted by the learned and able Mr. Porter, that there are in England and Wales 27,700,000 cultivated acres: in Ireland 12,125,000; and in Scotland about 5,265,000: in all, 45,090,000: and of these, he calculates that there are at present in cultivation by the spade and the plough 19,237,000 acres, and 27,000,000 in pasturage. That is just about two acres to every human being in the United Kingdom; the number of inhabitants in Great Britain and Ireland, in 1827, being about 23,000,000, and the same proportion probably obtains at the present time, when their numbers are nearly 30,000,000. Now a full supply of subsistence for every living person in wheat is a quarter a year; so that at this rate there is only *one* quarter raised over the whole empire for every *two* acres of arable and meadow land. But an acre of arable land yields, on an average of all England, two quarters and five bushels, or somewhat more than two quarters and a half; so that every two acres is capable, at the present average, of maintaining *five* human beings, or five times the present inhabitants of the empire. Can there be the smallest doubt that in a few years this quarter per half acre might be turned into two quarters per acre, less than the existing average of England? Nay, is there not ground to believe that, by greater exertion, every acre might be made to produce three quarters, still less than the average of many of its counties? The first of these changes would at once yield food for four times, the last for six times the present inhabitants of the British isles, independent altogether of the waste lands, &c., of which Mr. Cowling states there are 6,000,000 acres capable of being turned into arable and pasture lands, at present wholly uncultivated, which, at the same rate, would maintain nearly 20,000,000 more. So that, if these data are correct, it will follow that about 120,000,000 of human beings in the first view, and 180,000,000 in the second, supposing our present population to be in round numbers 30,000,000, might be maintained with ease and comfort from the territory of the United Kingdom alone; and supposing them all to be maintained on wheaten bread drawn from the arable, and butcher-meat raised on the pasture, lands, without any intermixture of potatoes or inferior food, which is greatly more productive.

"This alternative result, immense and incredible as it may appear, would only be at the rate of two or three persons to every acre of arable and meadow land in the kingdom—a proportion which is by no means impossible, if it be considered that three-fifths of the land brought into cultivation in Great Britain and Ireland, or 27,000,000 of acres, are in meadow and pasture: that one acre in wheat is perfectly capable of producing, on an average, two quarters, that is of maintaining two human beings; and that in potatoes, according to the best authorities, it will feed three times as many.

"But it is superfluous to go into these details on speculative points never likely to be realized in practice. Suffice it to say, therefore, that, on the most moderate calculation, Great Britain and Ireland are capable of maintaining, in ease and affluence, 120,000,000 of inhabitants. This proceeds on the supposition, that the whole mountain and waste land is deducted as altogether unprofitable, and that the remaining arable land is divided into three parts, of which two-thirds are entirely set aside for luxuries and conveniences, and that the remaining third alone is devoted to the staple food of man, partly in wheat and partly in potatoes."—(vol. i. pp. 48—51.)

But Mr. Alison does not rest contented with a single instance; he presents the same argument again and again; and each time, as the ponderous roller passes over the fallen fragments of Malthusianism, smaller and smaller wax the particles, till at last the wind

whistles over the plain, and the last atoms disappear upon the blast. Thus returns the crushing engine once more across the wreck :—

“The basin of the Mississippi alone contains, according to Chevalier, 1,015,000 square geographical miles, or more than eleven times the whole surface of the British isles, and nearly seven times that of the whole kingdom of France. The whole of that splendid surface is not only rich and fertile, but watered with noble rivers, and almost entirely destitute of hills or sterile spots. If it was peopled in the same proportion as the British isles, this portion of America alone, lying between the Alleghany and the Rocky mountains, would contain above 350,000,000 of inhabitants. South and North America contain nearly 12,000,000 square miles, of which 6,000,000 may be considered as susceptible of cultivation, and of productive powers, as Humboldt has told us, far greater than even the most favoured regions of Europe. If these 6,000,000 of square miles were cultivated, so as to produce even the same amount of subsistence as the British islands, they would yield subsistence to 1,500,000,000. It is no wonder that both Humboldt and General Miller, when traversing these boundless tracts of fertile land, where labour for three days in the week would make any family comfortable, and the produce of wheat, under even the most wretched culture, was never less than seventy, sometimes an hundredfold, should have been impressed with a sense of the boundless immensity of the gifts of Nature, and of the unhappy effects of those arbitrary institutions, and that squalid poverty, which in so many places retains multitudes in indigence and suffering in a world groaning under the riches of nature.”—(vol. i. pp. 74, 75.)

And once more ; and with this crush Malthusianism is gone :—

“The habitable terrestrial globe contains 37,673,000 square geographical miles, of which it is probable that upwards of 20,000,000 are available for the subsistence of the human race. This is making a very large deduction for the arid deserts of the torrid, or the frozen mountains of the arctic, zone. Now in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland there are 91,000 square geographical miles, and on them food is now raised for nearly 30,000,000 of human beings. If, therefore, the whole world were peopled in the same proportion as the British islands, there would be about two hundred and twenty times as many inhabitants as there now are in the United Kingdom, or the globe would contain 6,600,000,000, being at least eight times its present population. When the vast superiority of the productive powers of the southern regions of the globe are taken into consideration, as well as the great increase which it has been shewn the British islands themselves can be brought to yield ; when it is recollected, that, in almost all the southern climates, two crops are obtained in the year from soil where irrigation can be attained ; that the potato will maintain three times as many human beings on an equal extent of ground as wheat, and the banana, according to Humboldt, five-and-twenty times as many, it is not exceeding the bounds of reasonable argument to hold that this number of 6,600,000,000 might with ease be raised to 20,000,000,000, being above twenty times the whole probable population of the globe at this period.”—(vol. i. pp. 66, 67.)

The following passage is true, but poorly expressed :—

“ ‘ Whatever,’ says Dr. Johnson, ‘ makes the past or the future predominate over the present exalts us in the scale of thinking beings.’ When future ages shall come to reflect upon the fact, that for forty years the wisest philosophers, and the ablest statesmen, in an age boasting of the highest intellectual acquirements, implicitly adopted a theory in regard to the impossibility of making subsistence permanently keep pace with population, which

is directly contrary to the experience of every age, and inconsistent with the state which society had assumed in the very country where the doctrine first originated, they will regard this as one of the most singular instances of the truth of the saying of the great sage of the nineteenth century, and perhaps arrive at the conclusion, that the most enlightened age, equally with the rudest, is incapable of resisting the weight of considerations which strike the senses. It was by fixing their minds upon *present* objects, and reasoning on mankind, in general, from the example of the great increase of the Irish poor, and the American colonies, which immediately pressed on their attention, that nearly two generations have been imbued with this extraordinary delusion. Struck with the importance of the phenomena there exhibited, they have overlooked alike the history of the nations who have preceded, and the capacities for increase provided for those which are to follow them. The rapidity of progress in these two countries, which, as will be amply shown in the sequel, has arisen from extraneous and transitory causes, has been considered as the ordinary law of human increase: they have been regarded not as the exception but the rule. And what is singular and worthy of observation, these principles were generally conceived to be indisputable, just because the history of the world had afforded no instance in which their error could be brought to the test; the powers of production had everywhere so completely outstripped those of population, that their relative proportion was overlooked; the strength of the moral barriers provided by nature against an over increase of mankind was such, that it was never suspected how far even the most peopled communities were within the physical limits to their farther increase; and man was led to doubt the bounty of his Creator, from the magnitude of that very bounty having everywhere prevented him from approaching its limits."—(vol. i. pp. 79, 80.)

A more powerful pen than Mr. Alison's,—a pen capable of pouring forth "thoughts that glow and words that burn," would be required to do justice to this subject. It is, indeed, one of the chief disgraces of the last generation, that it tolerated,—aye, and even *honoured*,—this most profane and irreligious theory. Destitute of all solid foundation, audaciously opposing itself to the whole tenor of God's word, and outraging every feeling of kindness and benevolence which still remained in the human heart,—this wicked system, boldly addressing itself to the *selfishness* of man, rose, almost at once, to dominion, and for nearly half a century exercised a powerful sway over the educated classes in England. It came to its end, in 1830, by the publication of Mr. Sadler's work; and the greatest fault in Mr. Alison's work is, that he shrinks from assigning to Mr. Sadler the honour which is his due.

We know not to what cause this error is to be ascribed. Mr. Alison is careful to apprise us, that his own work was completed in 1828; so that the system of Mr. Sadler could not have then come before him. Whether, in publishing his own work, twelve years after, with so slight and unjust a notice of Mr. Sadler's, he acted under the ordinary feelings of literary jealousy,—or whether his mind, fully charged with his own system, was incapable of receiving and properly digesting another,—or whether, from a mixture

of both these feelings, he neglected to give Mr. Sadler's book a sufficient share of his attention,—it is impossible for us to know. The fact, however, remains the same. Mr. Malthus's system retained its authority up to 1830, when Mr. Sadler's work appeared; and in five years after, it was gone! This was a result which none of its former assailants,—though they had been many,—had produced; but it followed the appearance of Mr. Sadler's book, simply because that work did what no other antagonist work had done, and what Mr. Alison's does not do—it not only showed Mr. Malthus's system to be false and untenable, but it offered in its room a theory which was irrefragably *true*;—so indisputably true that not so much as a single plausible objection has ever been advanced against it. It was *this* that closed the reign of Malthusianism;—and nothing short of this would ever have wrought that wonder. “Nature abhors a vacuum;” and men required that he who demanded the expulsion of the falsehood should produce the truth which claimed to stand in its place.

But enough of this. We have already said, that the *one* topic which Mr. Alison has chosen to place in his title-page is just that in which he is least effective. To demolish Malthus is indeed quite within his power;—but here he pauses. His success, in this department, is merely a negative, a *dis*-proving strength. He annihilates the heresy; but he erects no truth in its place. In other questions he is more at home. If we trespass on our reader's patience with the following extract, we do it in the certainty that it will give value to our pages, and that none who will bestow a few moments on its perusal will blame our freedom in largely copying from such an author. Mr. Alison is treating of the *Wants of the Country* at the present moment:—

“The rapid augmentation of population in the British empire, which is now doubling in forty-two years—a rate of increase unparalleled in an old state—has completely outstripped all the means of moral or religious information afforded to the people, and spread such habits among a large portion of them as render moral improvement almost hopeless. The Church Establishment perhaps was adequate, but barely so, at the beginning of the century; but since that time the people have nearly *doubled*. Has a corresponding increase been made in the means of their religious tuition? Experience has made it but too evident that this vital duty has been fatally neglected; and that, in the midst of a Christian land, we have nursed up a race of men so utterly destitute of all information on moral duty or religious truth, that the like of it was never seen in any heathen state.

“The constant employment of the young in manufactories for fourteen hours a day renders it almost impossible for any education to do them much good; for who after such a period of daily toil could sit down to the additional labour of learning anything? It is almost barbarity to propose it. The only relief to the poor children is to send them to their beds. This deplorable state of matters cannot be remedied by voluntary charity, or even the unwearied exertions of the benevolent; they have been strained to the

uttermost, and found wholly unequal to the task. Nothing but the strong hand of Government, and an assessment reaching the vast funds of the selfish and indifferent, as well as the humane, is adequate to the remedy of the evil. Whether such a task will ever be undertaken by the Legislature, or submitted to by the country, may be doubted; but this may be affirmed without hesitation, that if this great duty is not discharged, and that too without delay, by the nation, the seeds of ruin are, by the laws of God, sown, and justly sown in the community; and that such will be the depravity and wretchedness of the people on whom the visitation will fall, that even Timour, with his pyramids of ninety thousand heads, would be deemed a messenger of mercy to mankind.

“The total want of poor's rates, or any legal provision whatever for the indigent in great part of Scotland, and the miserably parsimonious spirit in which they have been administered, even where necessity has forced their adoption, must be reckoned in the foremost rank of the many evils which have now induced a diseased action of the principle of population in a large portion of society. Extensive inquiries have now ascertained the lamentable fact, that there are at least 250,000 human beings in Scotland—nearly a tenth of the existing population—who are in a state of almost total destitution, and are permanently retained in that state by the obstinate resistance which the affluent classes make in many places to any assessment, at all—in all, to any adequate assessment for their relief. The paupers of Scotland are in fact just as numerous, or more so in proportion to the whole numbers of the people, as those in England. There is only this difference between them, that those to the south of the Tweed are, comparatively speaking, comfortably maintained; while those to the north of it are allowed to pine and waste in obscurity, until their misery attracts the casual and too often fleeting notice of the benevolent.

“Even when relief is administered, it is done in so extremely economical, or rather niggardly a spirit, that it has no sensible effect in arresting the evils of pauperism, or checking the stream of redundant population, which is in consequence flowing over the land. The board given to paupers is so small, that, though it supports life, it does so only in the lowest possible grade, and consequently, without really assuaging present distress, permanently lowers the habits of the people. Yet such as it is, it is gladly accepted by hundreds and thousands, who flock there from the Highlands and Islands, to avoid the utter starvation which awaits them in those mountain-districts, where no relief whatever is afforded. Nothing can be expected from the permanent and habitual retention of so large a portion of the community in such a state of deplorable destitution, but a diseased and wholly unrestrained action of the principle of increase, and a general and progressive deterioration of their habits, and depravation of their morals. These effects, accordingly, have very generally taken place; and though unattended to by superficial observers, or those who took from books their accounts of the Scottish poor, they have been long familiar to those who were practically acquainted with their situation. While the great majority of the Scotch proprietors were congratulating themselves upon their happy exemption from the burden of poor's rates which pressed so heavily on their neighbours in England, and fondly dreaming of the moral habits and general felicity of the peasantry on their estates, the criminal records have exhibited an increase of crime during the last thirty years unparalleled in any other state of Europe; and the researches of unwearied philanthropy have brought to light a mass of indigence and suffering in its great towns and Highland districts, which, to say the least of it, is a disgrace to any Christian community, and cannot remain long unrelieved without overspreading the land with the want, the crimes, and the insecurity of Ireland.

“Is then the condition of the human race in these islands utterly desperate? Can nothing be done to relieve the distresses which press with such severity upon, and have given such an undue tendency to increase to the

poor? And must we sit down in hopeless despair, under the grievous spectacle of multitudes starving in the midst of plenty?

"The answer is, that this is not necessary; that the British empire contains within itself abundant resources for feeding its numerous offspring; that immense and fertile districts exist, capable of maintaining with ease an hundred times the inhabitants of these islands; that the growth of these distant possessions is only retarded by the impossibility of finding hands to satisfy their insatiable demand for labour; that the multitudes of destitute labourers who now oppress our industry would be as great an acquisition to them, as their removal would be a relief to ourselves; and that adequate means exist for transporting the living swarm across the ocean, and rearing up in transatlantic wilds, boundless markets for the industry of the heart of the empire.

• • • • • • •

"Even at home, among so many causes for anxiety and disquietude in surveying the present condition of the labouring poor in the British empire, some streaks of light are beginning to appear in the horizon, and political danger promises to second the efforts of benevolence, in forcibly directing the national attention to the means of arresting them. It is forgetfulness of the poor to which we owe almost all our present dangers; it is inattention to them that the remedy is to be found. Philosophic indifference was the principle which perverted the mind of the nation in this vital particular in the last generation; the only cure for it is to be drawn from RELIGIOUS ZEAL and CHRISTIAN CHARITY in the present. It is in that noble principle, not merely animating individuals, but directing the Legislature, which is the true foundation of national security. Already the commencement of a change is conspicuous; and we may see how powerfully the efforts of the leaders in this great work are seconded by the eternal laws of Nature. The eloquence of an Ashley might have toiled unnoticed for years in exposing the manifold evils of the factory system; the fervour of a Chalmers laboured in vain to rouse a selfish generation to the paramount duty of Church extension; the philanthropy of an Alison fruitlessly contended with the ignorant impatience of taxation in mankind, in behalf of the destitute poor of his country; but when the evils of the humbler classes wrought out their natural and inevitable effect in multiplying beyond measure their numbers, and endangering from their pressure and wickedness all the institutions of society; when the torch of the Chartist was to be seen in our cities, and the conflagration of the incendiary in our fields, the mind of the nation righted itself, and a sense of apprehension gave force to the suggestions of benevolence and weight, to the dictates of wisdom. And herein we may discern the design of Providence in that vehement action to the principle of population, which is consequent on general suffering among the poorer classes of society, and which at first sight appears so strange a provision and disastrous a tendency in human affairs. It was to give weight to the injured class, to draw attention to their sufferings, to make the force of numbers counterbalance the power of property, and compel a remedy for existing evils, if not from the virtues, at least from the fears of the higher classes, that this terrible expansive power was given to the lower; and their redundancy in population, itself apparently the most serious, because the most incurable evil which can afflict society, is found to be the means employed by Nature, like the swelling of a limb into which poisonous or irritating matter has been introduced, for expelling the destructive substance from the frame of society."—(vol. i. pp. 534—541.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF ST. CYPRIAN. By the Rev. G. A. POOLE, Incumbent of St. James's Church, Leeds. Oxford: *Parker*. 1840.

THE life of Cyprian, and of the early Fathers in general, may be read and studied in two different and opposite lights. If we approach them with Christian sobriety of thought, we shall find in them a striking exhibition of Divine grace, mingled with proofs, not less conspicuous, of human error and weakness. Our faith in the solemn doctrine of man's fall will be thus confirmed, when we trace the working of sin and corruption in holy men; and at the same time our gratitude for the gospel of Christ will grow deeper and stronger, when we view its mighty and transforming power in those saints of earlier days. We shall learn also the unity of saving truth in every age; and be more watchful ourselves against corruptions of the faith, when we mark the stealthy progress of that "mystery of iniquity" which began to work even in the days of the Apostles themselves.

On the other hand, the same lives may be made the fuel of a blind and superstitious reverence. The Fathers of the Church may be exalted into final authorities, and the oracles of God be practically superseded. We may turn to their writings with a slavish deference, and forge them, by our rash credulity, into an iron yoke of bondage, as if Christians were the servants of men, and not the freemen of the Lord. We may thus inhale from the early Church an atmosphere of ceremonial superstition, growing thicker from age to age, till the healthy tone of true godliness and spiritual religion is totally blighted and destroyed.

The present work partakes too much of this last character. It may claim some degree of merit for the simplicity of its style and the completeness of its narrative; but it is grievously wanting in the far higher excellences of scriptural soundness of doctrine and fulness of spiritual discernment. The Christian religion is debased from its heavenly glory and quickening power into a matter of forms and rubrics, of rites and ceremonies. Under the influence of this spirit, the character of Cyprian is made the object of unmingled praise; his reasonings and comments elevated into conclusive authorities; uniformity of visible succession usurps the place of the true Christian unity, living faith and devoted love; and the sufficiency and supreme authority of God's holy word are dangerously obscured. Instead, then, of an historical review, which our limits scarcely allow, we will bestow a few words upon

this perplexed and important topic, the true authority of primitive tradition and the early Fathers, in the Christian Church.

Some writers then—whom we should be sorry to confound with formalists, falsely styled Catholic—agree with them in this one point, that they assert the interpretation of the early Church to be our only safe guide to the meaning of Scripture. They renounce heartily the later corruptions of Rome; they disclaim the binding authority of early institutions, unsanctioned by Scripture; they even reject tradition, as a distinct and independent source of saving truth. But still they maintain that the truth of Scripture itself can be severed from the counterfeits of heresy and private opinion, only by taking for our guide the concurrent interpretation of the early Fathers. Now this we regard as a grievous error, which threatens, at the present time, to bring into peril the faith of the Christian Church; and we shall therefore endeavour to expose the fallacy on which it rests, and explain the secret cause from which it springs.

The great source then of this delusive theory is a dread of the evils of uncontrolled private judgment. The most fatal and monstrous heresies, it is clearly seen, have been maintained by a presumptuous abuse of the Scriptures. Hence it is hastily inferred that some further barrier is needful, to preserve the Church from a flood of deadly and poisonous errors. And the simplest they can devise is the authoritative interpretation of the early Church, before the stream of doctrine has wandered too far from its Apostolic source, and ceases therefore to be a safe and reasonable guide. Thus a partial compromise is made between the theoretical sufficiency of Scripture, and the practical need, as they imagine, of some further restraint of human authority. They are only careful, in this spiritual partnership, to restrict authority to the purer and earlier ages of the Church, and to the province of interpretation alone; and thus hope to reap all the advantage, and avoid all the danger, of this suspicious ally.

Now our first remark upon this ingenious theory is, that it has no countenance whatever from the word of God. The Scriptures are quite silent upon this method of removing their own ambiguity, by an appeal to uninspired writers. Nay, their whole tone is directly opposite. The Bereans are commended for trying the doctrine even of the Apostles by the Old Testament writings. Our blessed Lord himself, confirming his words by countless miracles of love, still condescends to appeal continually to the written oracles; and instructs his very adversaries to search the Scriptures, as the sure witnesses to his Divine glory. When He is contending with the grand father of heresies and lies, by whom Scrip-

ture itself is wrested to strengthen those diabolical temptations, then, if ever, some extraneous help might have been thought needful. But our Lord, by his expressive silence, condemns all recourse to the deceitful help of human interpretations. His simple answer to the Tempter is, "It is written again." How plainly does He teach us that the sword of the Spirit alone, without human additions, is able to hew in pieces the most subtle falsehoods which Satan can devise.

We observe next, that this remedy for the dangers of private judgment is an impossible attempt to cure an evil inherent in the nature of things, and affecting the very work of redemption. Divine truth, in order to exert its saving power, must be received, by each Christian for himself, into his heart and conscience. This is the very aim of the Gospel, the grand work of the Spirit of God for the salvation of man. But before the truth can be thus received, it must of necessity be exposed to all the obstacles which man's perverse will and darkened understanding throw in its way. Judgment, to be real, and faith, to be genuine, must be the act of the individual mind. They must be exposed, then, to all the errors and delusions, which are so natural to man's fallen heart. But to proscribe the exercise of private judgment on this ground, or to bring in human authority to remedy the insufficiency of God's word, is as mad and foolish as to stay the rain from heaven, because the poison-tree is watered thereby into a more rank and deadly luxuriance. The Church would thus become like an unnatural mother, who, to repress the wayward follies of her children, strangles them with her own hands. What indeed is the practical effect, wherever this yoke of human authority has been imposed? The whole history of the Church will teach us. The springs of thought have been dried up; religion has fast sunk into a round of unmeaning forms; and the end has been torpor, apathy, and spiritual death.

But we advance still further, and assert that the remedy only aggravates the evil which it professes to cure. The danger of private judgment must arise either from the perverseness of the will or the weakness of the understanding: let us consider them in succession. We suppose the case of a heretic obstinately bent upon wresting the truth. In which appeal should we have the better hope of success;—to the Scriptures alone, or to the Scriptures interpreted by the Fathers? In the one case we meet him with the pure words of God; in the other, with the words of fallible men. In the first case the authority is divine, and therefore solid and convincing; in the other it is human, and therefore at best doubtful, if not rather nugatory and vain. In the one case the

field of inquiry is of moderate extent ; in the other interminable and boundless. In the one there is a harmony of truth complete and unerring ; in the other a mixture of gross errors and glaring contradictions. In short, when we appeal to Scripture alone, we wage the conflict against error within a boundary clearly marked, and with a sword, like Michael's, of heavenly temper ; in the other case, a vast jungle is our field of combat, and our weapon a broken reed.

The other source of danger in the exercise of private judgment is the natural weakness of the understanding. Even conscientious inquirers are, from this cause, often misled into serious error. But how much is this danger aggravated when the interpretations of the Fathers are taken for our guide, instead of the simple word of God. A single book, accessible to all, free from error, simple in style, complete in its various wisdom, and stamped with the plain impress of divine authority, is then replaced by a series of writers, voluminous, imperfect, and to many inaccessible ; jarring in their statements, imbued with human prejudices, tainted with growing superstitions ; and even where they retain the deposit of inspired truth, presenting it to us stripped of no small part of its divine majesty, and garbled with many fond inventions of man. How absurd to think that the danger arising from defect of natural powers can be lessened by recourse to their writings for guidance in divine truth !

Is there no remedy, then, for the evils by which the Church of Christ is threatened from the rash abuse of private judgment ? Yes, doubtless, but of a very different kind. It is the purification of the heart by the word of God itself ; it is the strengthening of the understanding by continual converse with heavenly truth in its pure fountain-head, the inspired Scriptures. This is the only sound and safe remedy, and this will never fail to succeed. " I have more understanding than my teachers," the Psalmist declares, not " because I have studied the comments of men," but " because thy testimonies are my meditation." Whatever real difficulty there is in this course is unavoidable in our fallen state, and is increased tenfold by recourse to any other. There would be nothing vast or difficult in the work of redemption, if divine truth found an easy entrance into the sinful heart. But however great the real obstacles, the fire and the hammer of God's holy word must have far more power to subdue them, than a cumbrous apparatus of human authorities and uninspired writings. Let us hold fast, then, as Christians and churchmen, our own principles ; let us maintain firmly the great maxim, " Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it

should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought necessary to salvation."

But to return to our Author. The life of St. Cyprian, as here written, affords many striking confirmations of these remarks, and gives warning of the Egyptian darkness which soon results from an appeal to the Fathers in place of inspired Scripture. Thus, in page 19, after Cyprian's account of his own experience, the following remarks are appended:—

"Thus does St. Cyprian speak of the grace of baptism, as a matter of his individual experience. In other parts of his works he treats of baptism dogmatically; and says, again and again, that therein we receive the Spirit, have our sins remitted, and are born again. And nothing can more assuredly manifest the consent of the Church in this doctrine, than the way in which he makes these assertions. He does not go about *to prove them*; no, this was unnecessary, since they were confessed by all: nor were they in his day, nor till 1200 years after, a subject of controversy; but he assumes them as premises mutually agreed upon, from which to deduce the Catholic doctrine on another subject. In a word, in Cyprian's days, and long after, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was no more questioned in the Church than the first axioms in geometry are questioned in our schools. If some pretended demonstration should involve the denial of the proposition, that the whole is greater than a part, it would be rejected with contempt, without further refutation, and so, if some new doctrine or custom should be clearly inconsistent with the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, that alone, in the eyes of the primitive Christians, would have branded it as false and heretical.

"It was usual for the new convert to receive another name at baptism: a custom fairly derived from the authority of our Saviour himself, in giving new names to some of his earliest disciples; and one, too, which well enough harmonized with the solemn occasion of that new birth, wherein we put off the old man, and put on the new man, with all his attendant duties and privileges."—(pp. 19, 20.)

Here baptismal regeneration is exalted into an axiom of mathematical certainty, on the warrant of Cyprian's experience, and the alleged consent of the primitive Church. But what the Author means or understands by the doctrine, we are left to surmise, and in which, out of twenty possible meanings, it was understood by the Church, he does not inform us. Mathematicians, in enquiries far less solemn or important than those on which salvation depends, would be ashamed of such vagueness in their axioms. But taken in the sense which the Author, we suspect from other statements, attaches to it—the universal, necessary sequence of spiritual regeneration upon outward baptism—we observe, first, that Cyprian's statement, taken at the full, could only prove the connexion in his own case, which no one can doubt to have been very possible, and far from involving an universal truth; next, that St. Peter, a higher authority than Cyprian, or all the early Church combined, seems to have been quite unconscious of this axiom in the case of Simon Magus, "I perceive thou art yet in the gall of bitterness, and the bond of

iniquity ;” and thirdly, that our Church, which limits the grace of baptism to those “ who receive it rightly,” seems equally ignorant of this self-evident truth ! We are pained to see how soon, in that land of fog and mist in which our Author delights, all clearness of spiritual vision and discernment, are blotted from the mind.

The mention of the treatise, “ *De Habitu Virginum*,” leads the Author to some strictures on “ *Ancient Christianity*,” in which the same bias appears, with an offensive and discourteous tone towards Mr. Taylor, which we cannot but reprobate. We do not ourselves accord fully with that writer’s line of thought, though we believe that his work contains important truth and salutary warnings. But it is pitiable weakness to treat him as he is here treated. Besides worse insinuations, we are told, “ that it is too late for him to acquire the tact, without which the Fathers cannot be understood ;” that “ the irreverent and impure will revel in his pages ;” and that “ the Church of God will weep at the *impiety* of her son.” We leave such passages to speak for themselves ; only we must observe, in passing, how happily consistent it is to refer Christians in general to the Fathers as their guides, when a writer who has few superiors in piety and intelligence cannot, it seems, expect to understand them, unless he have read them from his very childhood ! But to those who would exalt the Fathers into idols, such works are, doubtless, branded with deep impiety. “ Ye have taken away my gods,—and do ye ask, what aileth me ?”

The fact recorded of Novatian in page 149 is given by our Author to show the awful guilt of an heretic. It seems to us to convey a still deeper lesson. We are told that Novatian sent for three Italian Bishops, on pretence of needing their intercession with Cornelius ; that he engaged them in a feast, got them intoxicated by the close of the day, and then, “ by the imposition of the hands of the three Bishops, he obtained episcopal orders.” Our Author seems, from his following remarks, to admit that this impious mockery conferred the orders of a bishop, but not the influence, or the diocese, which the three bishops had not to bestow. Of course, had one of the three been a simple Presbyter, the whole would have been void ; but since all the three were bishops, and only intoxicated, their orders were valid. Now we think it useless to reason gravely with an English clergyman who can adopt a view so monstrous as this. But we ask our readers, how must the canker of superstitious delusion have eaten away the very power of natural conscience, when even a heretic could hope to strengthen his cause in the Church by so impious a mockery ? Such facts may open our eyes, more than grave reasoning, to the folly and danger of magnifying a bare succession of orders, if un-

accompanied by soundness of doctrine, conscientiousness of deportment, spirituality of mind, and the other scriptural fences of the sacred ministry of God's word.

What, again, must we think of our Author's statement in the next page, where he speaks of the oath administered by Novatian "while he held their hands, together with the body of Christ, between his own?" Here we see an English, unhappily we cannot say a Protestant, clergyman, asserting the *local presence* of the body of Christ in the hands of the communicant. Where such a style of language begins to appear within our holy and beloved Church, the words of Moses force themselves to our lips—"There is wrath gone out from the Lord: the plague is begun." We must remind the Author of his own plain subscription, "The body of Christ is given, taken, and received in the sacrament *only* after a *heavenly and spiritual* manner; and the mean whereby it is received and eaten is *Faith*."

Another instance of the strange tone of reasoning which our Author adopts, in his deference to the Fathers, is as follows:—

" 'That exhilaration,' says he, 'produced by the cup of the Lord and his blood, not being like that which is produced by common wine, the Psalmist declares the exhilarating cup to be very good: for the cup of the Lord so exhilarates those who drink it, as to make them sober.' These few words are sufficient to indicate the drift of his reasoning here; and to show, also, that it would be absurd, if no especial grace was conveyed to the recipients by means of the cup; or if the whole efficacy of the Eucharist resided in either kind."—(p. 286.)

This is an instructive specimen of the fatal effects which result from making the Fathers authorities instead of Scripture itself. A fanciful application by Cyprian of a mistranslated text is adopted as a conclusive argument against the Romanists. How entirely the reason must have been clouded by a theology of mists and shadows, before the mind could gravely rest on such arguments as these!

In the next page we have the following question quoted with approbation. "How shall we drink new wine of the fruit of the vine with Christ in the kingdom of the Father, if in the sacrifice we offer not the wine of God the Father and of Christ, *nor mix the cup of the Lord according to the divine tradition?*" Mr. Poole then proceeds to disprove transubstantiation, on the strength of the following extract:—

" 'That waters signify people, Holy Scripture tells us in the Apocalypse, when saying, *The waters which thou sawest, upon which that harlot sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations of the heathen, and tongues.* And the like figure we see is contained in the sacrament of the cup: for since Christ bare us all, who also bare our sins, we perceive that the people is to be understood in the water, while the blood of Christ is shown in the wine. When, therefore, water is mingled with wine in the cup, the people is made one by Christ, and the host of the believing is associated and joined with Him, in whom they have believed. Which association and conjunction of water and of wine is

so made in the cup of the Lord, that there can be no separation of either from the commixture. Whence it cometh, that nothing can separate the Church, that is, the multitude constituting the Church, and maintaining faithfully and with unmoved constancy, that faith which it hath received, from Christ, so as to shake their inseparable love, or to put an end to it. Therefore on no account can water be offered alone, in the consecration of the cup, nor wine alone: for if any one offers only wine, the blood of Christ begins to exist without us; but if the water be alone, the people begins to be without Christ: but when both are mixed together, and combined by a perfect union, then is the spiritual and heavenly sacrament perfected. And so neither water alone, nor wine alone, is the cup of the Lord, unless each be mingled with the other; just as neither flour alone, nor water alone, can be the body of the Lord; but both must be joined together, and united in the substance of one loaf. In which sacrament also the people is displayed united; for as many grains collected together, and mingled and joined one with another, make one loaf; so in Christ, who is the heavenly bread, we know that there is but one body, with which the whole number of the faithful is conjoined and made one.'''—(pp. 296—298.)

This passage alone might serve to convince every serious Christian how unsafe it is to follow blindly the expositions of the Fathers, and how utterly absurd to make them the basis of controversial argument. Could it be credited that a Presbyter of sound mind would argue against transubstantiation on the warrant of a passage, which would prove every sacrament he has celebrated to be sacrilegious and vain? Yet such is the case here. And what a weak reason does Cyprian allege for this human tradition! For ourselves, if the practice must be accounted figurative, the prophet, we think, supplies a far juster exposition in his indignant rebuke, "Thy wine is mixed with water:" and its continuance may be viewed as a silent warning of that early intermixture of human inventions with the new wine of the Gospel, which so early and fatally prevailed in the Church. The history of the cup would thus be a parable of the history of the Gospel itself. The visible Church first corrupted it with unhallowed mixtures, and at last the Church of Rome withheld it altogether.

But we must suspend these brief observations. We regret that the dangerous theories of human tradition make it needful, in contending for the truth, to have even the appearance of disparaging the saints of God, whom from our hearts we reverence and esteem. We doubt not that Cyprian, in the day of the Lord Christ, will be found among his most honoured followers. But he will then have outgrown his earthly errors and infirmities, which his superstitious admirers would enshrine; he will then have gained that true Catholicity which gladly owns the work of God's Spirit, wherever the real fruits of His presence are to be found; and which, while it prizes and values the visible ordinances of the Church, has learned to view them in their true light, as means to a most blessed end, the redemption of immortal souls to living holiness and eternal glory.

A LETTER TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR JOHN CAM HOBHOUSE, Bart., M.P., *on the Question of the Connexion of the East India Company with the Idolatry of that country.* London: Hatchards. 1841.

EVERY now and then, in watching the course of public events, we encounter evils of such appalling magnitude, and yet obviously so easy of removal, that we are ready to exclaim, "Surely these things need but to be exposed to the reprobation of the good and wise in order to be instantaneously redressed." But experience soon convinces us of our mistake, and teaches us how wide is commonly the interval between the acknowledgment of national guilt, and the practical exhibition of national repentance and amendment. "Great bodies move slowly." The apophthegm is a trite one. We may however be allowed to remark, that its most signal illustration, in the moral world at least, is furnished by the class of instances to which we have referred. The agitation of the Slave Trade question was begun in Parliament in the year 1789;—not until 1806 was the British Slave Trade abolished. The first national confession of the guilt of slavery was the adoption, by the House of Commons, of Mr. Canning's celebrated Resolutions of 1823;—not until 1834 did West India Slavery receive its death-blow at the hands of the Legislature; and not until 1838 was the last remnant of it finally swept away.

The title of the pamphlet which we have quoted at the head of this article, calls our attention to a not less melancholy exemplification of the same truth; with this difference too, that whilst negro slavery and the slave trade have at length disappeared from amongst us, we are at this very hour guilty before God and man of upholding and abetting, nay of actually participating in, the most monstrous system of idolatry and pollution ever witnessed upon earth. To the establishment of this proposition we purpose to devote the remainder of the present article; and in so doing, shall largely avail ourselves of the labours of the excellent author (Mr. J. M. Strachan) of the pamphlet mentioned above.

What we have in the first place to speak of—the character, namely, of Hindoo idolatry—shall occupy as small a space as the subject will admit. Its full development, even had we room for it, would be far too hideous and revolting. There are two annual festivals of especial popularity in Eastern India—the Durga Poojah and the Charak Poojah, both celebrated in honour of Parvati the wife of Shiva, but under different forms. In the character of the

destroyer of the Giant Durga, whose name she assumed in honour of her victory, she receives the homage of deluded thousands. Every family is then provided with an image of the goddess, fabricated expressly for the great yearly exhibition of madness and crime. "Passing," says Dr. Duff, in his work on Indian Missions, "along the streets of Calcutta, before, behind, on the right and on the left, here and there and everywhere you seem encompassed with a forest of images of different sizes, and piles of limbs and bodies and fragments of images of divers materials, finished and unfinished in all the intermediate stages of progressive fabrication."

The hour of greatest sanctity during the celebration of the Durga Poojah is eight o'clock in the evening. The devotee then enters the hall, and approaches the shrine. After innumerable contortions of the body and grotesque gesticulations, intermingled with senseless prayers to the idol, "he stretches himself at full length, disposing his body in such a manner as at once to touch the ground with the eight principal parts of his body, namely, the feet, the thighs, the hands, the breast, the mouth, the nose, the eyes, and forehead. Numbers having thus performed their worship, there succeeds a round of carousals and festivity. The spectators are entertained with fruits and sweetmeats. Musicians, with various hand and wind instruments, are introduced into the hall. Numbers of abandoned females, gaily attired and glittering with jewels, are hired for the occasion, to exhibit their wanton dances, and rehearse their indecent songs in praise of the idol, amid the plaudits of surrounding worshippers"—(Duff, p. 230.)

Elsewhere in his book the same well-informed writer describes the scenes of self-inflicted torture and mutilation, of indecent merriment, and more than brutal ferociousness daily to be witnessed during the period appropriated to the worship of Kali (another name of Parvati,) "the goddess of blood." But we will spare our readers the horrible recital, and content ourselves with describing this universal object of Hindoo worship. Kali is pictured with four arms. In one of her right hands is a naked scimitar, in the other the head of the giant Durga, torn and bleeding. Her lower left hand points to the earth, to intimate the fatal authority with which she is armed, her remaining hand upward towards heaven. Around her neck she wears a circlet of skulls; her ear-rings are mangled carcasses—a girdle of human hands encompasses her waist. Having drunk the blood of vanquished enemies, and of innumerable victims offered to her in sacrifice, her lips and brows are stained of a bloody hue, and a stream of blood pours down her breast. Invested with these

•

symbols of terror, and with her tongue thrust forth in bitter mockery from her lips, she is represented in the act of trampling her prostrate husband beneath her feet. It would be easy to furnish a long list of deities scarcely less horrible than Kali; but "ex uno disce omnes." Further to enlarge upon so painful a topic would be both needless and unprofitable. The features of an individual once distinctly sketched, (thus much we conceive to be necessary) the family resemblance of the whole group may be left to the imagination. We need not fear to give it full scope. Our worst conceptions cannot exceed—cannot equal the reality.

But the worship of their false gods within the precincts of their sacred temples, affords us, after all, a very inadequate view of the religion of the Hindoos. We ought to see it entering into, and influencing, uniformly for evil, all the relations of social and domestic life. We ought to witness the crushing tyranny—the slavery of soul and body—the violent disrapture of every restraining tie of decency, which are its natural and necessary fruits. We ought to know that its priests, as well as its clay and wooden idols, are literal objects of worship to infatuated multitudes. We ought to know that this detestable religion covers the land with brothels;* and crowds, at times, the streets of populous cities with processions of such monstrous impurity, as utterly to prohibit other than the most general mention of the fact.† But enough of these horrors. They who wish for fuller information, may find it, "usque ad nauseam," in publications issuing from the periodical press of India, in the journals of Christian teachers of every denomination, in the pages of such practical observers as the Abbé Dubois, and even in the despatches of officials connected with the government of the country.

And is it possible that in such systematized and wide-spreading wickedness, a Christian government has dared to participate; nay more, has lent its efforts to uphold and encourage it?—has actually assumed the office of its foster-mother, and nursed it into health and vigour? Is it further possible that such a state of things remains unrebuked, (no, thank God, not *unrebuked*) but unredressed at this very moment? Let us listen to Mr. Strachan, premising, in the first place, that he is only one of a host of witnesses to the same facts.

"Idolatry was decaying; the temples were dilapidated; its ceremonies neglected; the people were indifferent: interested parties of course be-

* "Nam quo non prostat foemina templo."—Juv.

† Will it be credited, that in a despatch dated October the 18th, 1837, the Court of East India Directors compares the Pagan rites and processions of the people of India to "our English feasts of May-day and Harvest-home, to the rites of Halloween and the village mummeries of Christmas?"

wailed the state of things; and in a fatal hour the provincial functionaries conceived it would tend to conciliate the regard of the people, if we became the patrons of the expiring superstition. Christianity was then also at a low ebb in India. It does not seem to have occurred to any one of the functionaries concerned, that there could be any offence to the national religious character, in assuming the office of patrons of the temples, and their idolatrous worship, of the Carnatic in the first instance, and afterwards of Tanjour. The suggestion to become in effect the *PONTIFEX MAXIMUS* of the country, was hailed as the happiest discovery for the peaceful management of the people. The local government readily adopted the suggestions of its revenue officers. The principle became eventually embodied in a regulation or law of the Supreme Government, No. XIX., of 1810, and was extended to Madras, by a regulation, No. VII., of 1817."—(p. 5.)

Thus much concerning the original offence. Now for the present state of the case:—

"The evils to which it is my object to draw attention may be classed under the two following heads:—

"1st. The compulsory attendance of the Company's Christian troops upon the idolatrous and superstitious ceremonies and festivals of the natives.

"2ndly. The management by the Company's revenue servants of the endowments of the native temples and mosques, and their interference with the interior economy of the same; gratuitous offerings to the idols, and payments for their worship and superstitious ceremonies."—(p. 13.)

Now be it observed that under the two heads which we have just quoted, our author sums up *the actually existing state in the year 1841*, of the East India Company's connection with Hindoo idolatry. We purpose to revert to the consideration of this summary by and by. Meanwhile we have somewhat further to urge against the parties implicated in this charge.

In the month of February 1833, a despatch prepared by Lord Glenelg, at that time President of the Board of Control, was transmitted by the court of East India Directors to the Governor General of India. The contents of that despatch were highly satisfactory to persons who felt the pressure of the evils complained of, on the spot, as well as to the Christian public of Great Britain. In a pamphlet published in 1838, Mr. Strachan thus describes it:—

"It displays a perfect understanding of the subject, and abounds in wise and statesman-like views of the principles by which the policy of our Indian administration should be guided. With unanswerable reasoning, it demonstrates the propriety of the measures then ordered to be carried into effect for changing the system of government, in relation to this subject."

Subsequent events, we mean events which have fallen out since the transmission of this despatch, have thrown an air of painful doubt upon the good faith for which the authorities issuing it received credit. One thing, at all events, is quite certain. In so

far as relates to the Presidency of Madras, the document in question remains to this day a dead letter.

"At Madras," says the editor of the *Friend of India*, quoted by Mr. Strachan in his latest pamphlet, "At Madras nothing is done. The old excuses and unmeaning promises are repeated, until they would sound perfectly ridiculous, if they were not a great deal worse. We fear that Lord Elphinstone allows himself to be overborne by the local prejudices of the benighted seat of his government. Official participation in the rites of idolatry has become, to many of the Madras civilians, *a part of the religion of their fathers; and they hold it with all the bigotry of an ancestral faith*, which usually makes up for its weakness of principle by intensity of prejudice."

Painful, in the highest degree, as is such a state of things, still it may be argued, by some, that it amounts at most to a charge of disobedience upon the part of local authorities to the commands of their superiors in England, and that it cannot implicate those superiors themselves in the guilt of desiring to uphold superstitions which they have repudiated and condemned. To this it might, of course, be easily replied, that every government is, and necessarily must be, deemed responsible for the deeds of its subordinates, in plain contravention of its own orders, so long as they are not called to account for their misconduct. But there is a more direct means of fixing the guilt of this bitter disappointment of our hopes upon the Honourable Court. The despatch of February the 20th, 1833, to which we have already referred, in recapitulating the orders of the Court directs as follows:—

"That no servant of the East India Company shall hereafter be engaged in the collection, or management, or custody of monies, in the nature of fines or offerings, under whatsoever name they may be known, or in whatever manner obtained, or whether furnished in cash or in kind.

"That no servant of the East India Company shall hereafter derive any emolument resulting from the above-mentioned or any similar sources.

"That in all matters relating to their temples, their worship, their festivals, their religious practices, their ceremonial observances, our native subjects be left entirely to themselves."

Now it is very true that in enjoining that these and similar orders should be carried into effect, a discretionary power with regard to time, was to a certain extent, and we admit necessarily, committed to the authorities of India. But what shall we say when *four years* after, and notwithstanding the numerous representations and discussions which had in the meantime taken place, with a view to rouse the reluctant Directors to a sense of their duty, we find them thus "opening afresh the whole question." We quote the last paragraph of a despatch to the Governor-General, dated February the 22d, 1837:—

"The details and minuteness of the accounts, and the retrospect they" (the Government of Bombay and the Accountant-General at Calcutta) "are required to take, embracing a period of ten years, must necessarily have required a considerable time in their due preparation; but it is desirable that no unnecessary delay should take place *in bringing forward the whole subject fully and intelligibly, in all its bearings, on the financial interests, on the political obligations, and on the moral character of our Government.*"

What a pregnant warning is here furnished to us of the vanity of human hopes when founded upon human promises!

But our censure of this unworthy duplicity would fail of producing its full effect upon the mind of the candid reader, did we refuse, or neglect, to give the Honourable Company such commendation as it has deserved. We acknowledge then, that in the Bengal Presidency it has abolished the odious pilgrim tax. More than this we dare not say. Certain provisions* accompany the act of abolition, which, in our judgment, not only, as Mr. Strachan observes, "lamentably impair its value," but render it very questionable how far we are justified in bestowing on it any praise at all.

We now return to the consideration of Mr. Strachan's charges against the East India Company, as already quoted by us. The present article has, however, thus far occupied so much of our space that our remaining observations must be far more brief than, under other circumstances, we could have desired, or than the importance of the subject demands. Under the head of "compulsory attendance of Christian troops" at processions,† where, be it remarked, no native Prince is present to furnish the pretence that the honour is paid to him and not to his religion, Mr. Strachan enumerates *twelve* distinct instances "of stated occurrence at Trichinopoly, a fortress, two hundred miles distant from the residence of the Nawaub whose ancestors' obsequies are there celebrated."

This, then, is part of the system which we condemn and deplore, as exhibited at a single place in Southern India. That it is worse than useless, for those upon whose consciences this forced participation in idolatry presses with leaden weight, to remonstrate against the injustice done them, the well-known reception met with by the petition of the clergy and officers of the Madras establishment,‡ lamentably proves.

* These are the assignment in perpetuity of "an annual allowance of 60,000 rupees" (£6000) to maintain the worship of Juggernaut, and the retention of "the management of the temple lands in the hands of the local revenue officers."

† It ought to be understood, that although the title-page of Mr. Strachan's pamphlet is confined to the mention of the East India Company's connection with *idolatry*, honour done to *Mahomedan* observances forms equally an object of his animadversions. The same remark is applicable to ourselves.

‡ Transmitted by the late venerated Bishop Corrie to Sir Frederick Adam, April 6th, 1836.

At Fort St. George (Madras) and elsewhere, it is customary to fire royal salutes in honour of all the principal festivals, whether Heathen or Mahomedan. Some of our readers may be curious to see copies of garrison orders issued on these occasions:—

“Garrison Orders, Fort St. George, 10th Jan. 1836.

“A royal salute to be fired from the saluting battery, at noon, to-morrow, on the occasion of the Pungal Festival.”

“21st January, 1836.

“A royal salute to be fired from the saluting battery, at noon, to-day, on the occasion of the Ramzan Festival.”

GARRISON ORDERS, TRICHINOPOLY.

“19th January, 1836.

“To-morrow being the conclusion of the Ramzan Festival, a company complete, under the command of a native officer in full dress, with one drummer and one fifer from the 46th regiment, N.I., as well as a brigade of six-pounders, with the requisite party of artillery attached, to parade to-morrow morning at six o'clock, at the Chouk (square) in the Fort.”

“Madras, 26th May, 1839 (Sunday!).* ”

“A royal salute to be held in readiness to be fired from the saluting battery at sun-rise, to-morrow, in answer to one which will be fired from the Chepauk Gardens on the occasion of the anniversary of the Rubeeool-Uwwal Festival.”

The impolicy of this miserable truckling to superstition and idolatry is a question so immeasurably inferior to that of its moral turpitude, that we are anxious to keep them wholly distinct. We have not space to consider both. We have chosen, therefore, to concentrate attention upon that which chiefly concerns us, as beings responsible for the manner in which we use the authority entrusted to us by a Holy God. Nevertheless it can scarcely be out of place to quote an extract from the letter of an officer of rank, which we find in Mr. Strachan's pages, as marking the sense entertained by the natives themselves of our guilt and folly:—

“To this day the attendance of troops at Nagpoor for the Dusserah, and the salutes from Fort St. George, at Heathen and Mahomedan festivals, continue to lower us in the eyes of the natives; for every salute we fire, though perhaps acceptable to one man, is at the same time an object of dislike to his neighbour of a different persuasion.”

The consideration of the second branch of his subject, namely,

* The following circumstance was related to us by a chaplain on the Madras establishment;—A friend and brother chaplain had been more than once disturbed by the noise and tumult of some idolatrous pageant passing the church during the celebration of Divine worship. He represented the evil, and petitioned for its redress in the proper quarter. An answer was soon received, to the effect that “Government could not permit the ceremonies of the natives to be interfered with.” On the subsequent recurrence of the procession, under like circumstances, *the House of God was obliged to be closed.*

“the administration of the religious endowments of the natives, and other instances of interference with their temples and worship,” Mr. Strachan, in the pamphlet before us, postpones, “until the papers ordered by the House of Lords to be printed, on the motion of the Bishop of London, on the 10th of August last, be furnished.”—(p. 33.)

While Mr. Strachan is thus waiting to complete his argument, we venture to press the following facts on the attention of our readers. Upon the testimony of witnesses of unquestionable credit, as well as upon the authority of their own published documents, we charge the government of Southern India—

1st, With undertaking the management of endowments for the maintenance of idolatry.

2ndly, With deriving a revenue from Hindoo offerings made to the idols.

3rdly, With furnishing supplies (clothing for example) for the use of the idols.

4thly, With retaining officers in pay, whose exclusive business is to see that idolatrous services are duly performed, and temples, sacred vessels, &c. kept in repair.

5thly, With superintending the appointment of women “married to the god,” in other words the infamous dancing girls.

And 6thly, To crown the whole, with presenting, amongst other gifts, to the goddess Yeggata at her great festival, in the name of the East India Company, the “tâli” or necklace, *the appropriate symbol of the marriage tie.*

The evidence in support of these allegations is, as we have already stated, too strong to be rebutted. Let, however, the parties accused, or their advocates, try the experiment. Let them clear themselves—if they can.

In closing the present article, we would endeavour to impress two points upon those of our readers who desire to take an active interest in the subject under consideration. In the first place, let them distinctly understand that what we desire from the East India Government is *not persecution of Hindooism, but toleration for Christianity.* We want the superstitions of India to be left to stand or fall according to their own merits. We want a Christian Government to abstain from outraging its own Christian profession, and the conscience of its Christian functionaries, by direct interference with heathen abominations. In a word we want protection for *all* classes of the community, Christians, Mahomedans, and Hindoos, so long as in the exercise of their right of thinking and judging for themselves, they neither trench on the rights of others, nor come into collision with the laws of the land.

Secondly, we entreat the friends of India to consider that, under God, success in this holy undertaking depends upon themselves. We have seen that neither on the East India Company, nor on the local Governments of India, can reliance be placed. It is but too evident that our own Government is equally averse to move, efficiently at least, in the matter.* All experience, in fact, teaches us the folly of trusting in man, and consequently the wisdom of "ceasing from man."

We know but of one infallible cure for the evil which at present we deplore. It is this. Let every right-minded member of the community deliberately, and in the strength of God, resolve that henceforth he will leave no lawful means, which he may have it in his power to use, unemployed—representations to friends and associates—petitions to Parliament—appeals to its members individually,—the circulation and diffusion of intelligence—crowning and sanctifying all his efforts by prayer to Him "by whom kings reign and princes decree judgment," until the unnatural union between a Christian Government and a system of the grossest moral putrescence becomes matter of history—until we are able to gather from reflecting upon it, encouragement to further exertion in the cause of righteousness, and a salutary warning how we rush, for the future, into perils from which, by God's mercy, we have once been delivered.

* We have now on the table before us a pamphlet, by a Wesleyan missionary (Mr. R. S. Hardy), bringing very fearful charges against *the British Government* for its patronage of the idolatry of Ceylon. Upon this subject it would be easy to enlarge, but we must not distract the attention of our readers.

HINTS ON THE QUESTION NOW AFFECTING THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, *addressed to Members of the Church of England; with a Letter to Viscount Sandon, M.P.*
By J. C. COLQUHOUN, Esq., M.P. Glasgow: Collins.

WE are generally considered by our brethren of the north of the Tweed as being in a state of profound ignorance, touching the merits of that perplexed question which now affects the Church of Scotland. It has been said by a distinguished champion of non-intrusion, that there are not half-a-dozen persons in England who really understand the subject. It may therefore seem presumptuous in us to attempt to treat a matter of so complicated a nature with our slender means and abilities; and it is only because we think that a little plain common sense will always go a long way towards the understanding of any question which is worth understanding, that we venture to descend upon the arena, where so many "combatants" have already been smitten "hip and thigh with a great slaughter." It is also consolatory to our ignorance to know, that there is much difference of opinion among the members of the Scotch Church; that even doctors disagree; and that statesmen who have studied the constitution of the Presbyterian Churches, including her Majesty's Ministers, do not know how to proceed; and, in short, from the Court of Session to the congregation at Marnoch, there appears to be nothing but misunderstanding. Civil law versus the "Books of Discipline;" the Parochial Court against the Presbytery; the Presbytery against the Synod, and the General Assembly against them all; and hence we conclude that there must be a considerable share of ignorance acting as an incubus on this question, or else there must be something worse. But although our worthy neighbours, with true Presbyterian pertinacity will not admit of any intrusion, they are determined to intrude their interminable disputes upon us; and, by way of securing our attention, they tell us, that if we continue to maintain a dogged indifference to the contest now proceeding in the Church of Scotland, we shall see by and by that democratic principles will invade our own Church, and our congregations will be calling aloud for the veto, and soon put a wholesome restraint upon our lay and clerical patrons. Mr. Colquhoun, who no doubt speaks the sentiments of a large and influential body of his countrymen, takes up this ground, and bids members of the Church of England look about them, for he says, "the shock of one institution endangers the whole fabric;" and his very motto, which he has

put in the title-page of his pamphlet, warns us against the coming destruction, unless we make the non-intrusion question our own : " *Nam tua res agitur, paries cum proximus ardet.*" Now we must confess that, for our part, we neither feel nor ever have felt the smallest alarm ; and we have viewed this pitiable contest with perfect indifference, as it regards any injurious results likely to arise to our national Establishment. We have lamented, along with all good and sober-minded persons, that such a scandal should have been brought upon the profession of a true faith, and that the enemy of all Church Establishments should have had such occasion given him for triumph. But as to a question which no persons have yet given themselves the trouble to understand (and probably very few in this section of Great Britain ever will), affecting our Church and its admirable polity, we have no such fear whatever. We can assure our Presbyterian friends, who tremble for the security of our Zion, that the waves which break from the storm in the North Sea dash harmlessly against our cliffs ; and that as long as we avoid that unholy mixture of things temporal and things spiritual, which has at length brought all this trouble upon the Scotch Church, we have no fears for any democratic principles making way in our ecclesiastical system.

One thing more we wish to premise before entering on the question. We are not among those " members of the Church of England, more zealous than wise," who look upon the present dislocation of the joints of Presbyterianism as a favourable opportunity for fitting in an Episcopalian system of discipline. We happen to have learnt history, and especially the history of Scotland, to somewhat better purpose, as we flatter ourselves. But as persons interested in maintaining the doctrines of our Articles, without any reference to Church government, we do sincerely regret the condition to which the General Assembly have brought the best interests of true and undefiled religion. And happy shall we be, if, as members of the Apostolic Church of England, we may contribute to restore the sister Church to its consideration and respect in the eyes of the bewildered people.

The object of Mr. Colquhoun's pamphlet is to put the question now affecting the Church of Scotland in an intelligible shape for English readers, and he very wisely begins by an explanation of the frame-work of the Church of Scotland. Throughout the whole ninety pages of " Hints," and eight more of an " Appendix," the intelligent Author, however, does not offer a single opinion upon the merits of the case. He blames neither non-intrusionist nor patron ; will not be a judge in the matter at all ; abstains from making any proposition, either to soften the remedy

of the Assembly in 1834, or to amend Lord Aberdeen's Bill ; and yet it is not difficult to gather, from the drift of his argument, what course the Honourable Member for Kilmarnock would pursue. We confess we were a little disappointed, when we arrived at the end of page 89, to find that Mr. Colquhoun proposes nothing but the very general measure of " a prompt and temperate adjustment of the question ;" and we are just left where we were before. Notwithstanding, we repeat, that we are greatly indebted to Mr. Colquhoun for his laborious, and in some respects striking, pamphlet, in which we see the mind of an enlightened Christian and patriot, anxious to hold the balance between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to remove the stigma which the late proceedings have fixed upon the Scottish Church and nation.

We are told, that in the constitution of the Church of Scotland there are four Ecclesiastical Courts, and they stand thus in the ascending scale :—1. The Parochial Court, which consists of the minister and four elders, with equal powers, and takes cognizance of every question affecting the ecclesiastical affairs of the parish. 2. The Presbytery, or Diocesan Courts, usually consisting of fourteen parishes ; to this is committed the power of ordination, the granting of licenses to preach, the suspending of ministers, and such like functions as with us would belong to the Bishop. The third court is the Provincial Synod, including five Presbyteries on an average, and this appears to be a court of appeal from inferior courts ; but if its decisions are not satisfactory to the appellant, the last appeal lies to the General Assembly, or supreme courts, whose decisions are final. The number of members of this great popular court, where the Queen's Majesty is supposed to preside (*stat nominis umbra*), is at present 413, of whom about 238 are ministers, and 175 elders.* The acts of Assembly, Mr. Colquhoun tells us (page 8) represent and embody the judgment of the people of Scotland, in so far as they belong to their National Church. Now this is no doubt all very useful information to the English reader, whose idea of the Church of Scotland generally is, that 238 Presbyters, in Synod assembled, make one Archbishop ; that there are no organs in the churches ; that the ministers wear no surplice, and seldom use the Lord's Prayer ; and that the sermons are very long, because they have no liturgy worth speaking of.

We must just remark, while we are on the subject of Presbyterian polity, that it embraced in its origin something of the episcopal regimen. According to the first Book of Discipline (see

* The first meeting of the General Assembly was held on the 20th December, 1560. It consisted of forty members only, six of whom were ministers ; John Knox was one. The first Moderator was John Willoch, Superintendent of Glasgow and the West.

M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 6), the permanent orders in the Church were of four kinds: the Minister or Pastor, to whom the administration of the sacraments belonged; the Doctor, or Teacher, whose province it was to interpret scripture, and drive away all erroneous doctrine; the ruling Elder, who assisted the minister in exercising ecclesiastical government; and the Deacon, who had the oversight of the revenues of the Church and of the poor. There were, besides these, the occasional officers, such as readers, employed in large parishes; and if they advanced in knowledge they were (after due examination and admission) called exhorters. The whole country was divided into ten dioceses, but care was taken to avoid that offensive term, and they were called districts; and for the same reason the overseers of those districts were not called Bishops, but superintendents. Their business was to preach, plant churches, inspect the conduct of the ministers, readers, and exhorters: and, in short, to exercise all the episcopal functions except ordination. In this primitive polity of the Church of Scotland we can see nothing but the shades of the three orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with just as much modern invention of nomenclature and duties as served to conceal the original. We have thought it well to fill up Mr. Colquhoun's sketch of the framework of the Scotch Church, that our readers may see how much after all it is indebted to Episcopacy for the elements of its conservative properties. It may be perfectly true, that while the Church in England was reformed without being destroyed, the Church in Scotland was entirely overthrown. But on this very account we cannot affect that sympathy with the newly-constituted ministers on account of the loss of the ecclesiastical revenues, which Mr. Colquhoun so eloquently expresses; for, however lawfully they might have belonged to a reformed Church as in England, they certainly did not belong to a Church entirely new in its constitution, and such as *the bequeathers of those revenues never contemplated*. We are not about to defend the Crown and the nobles in "their unrighteous conquest and spoilzie of the kirk," for the revenues did not belong to them either; but let it be observed, that the "miserable pittance which was wrung from the greedy Court and rapacious nobility, as a provision for the religious instruction of the people," was obtained before the new Church was established by law in 1592, and before the episcopal office, after a struggle of eighteen years, ceased.

The Church, by her never-ending opposition to the ancient form of ecclesiastical government, succeeded in abolishing prelacy, and securing a certain portion of its revenues. But there was another contest, not less arduous, about the *appointment* of ministers; and

the monstrous abuses which the State continued to maintain gave into the hands of the Presbyterians a righteous cause to defend. From the year 1565 to 1590 "the Church reiterated her complaints," and at last, in 1592, it was established as a rule, that "no one could be presented to a benefice except those whom the Church had certified; none could be admitted, when presented, unless they passed under her examination and approval."

The distinction between the two Churches of England and Scotland, as it respects their relations with the State, is very clearly defined by the learned Author of the "Hints." The one was embraced by the State, and therefore ran no risk of losing her independence; the other was shaken off by the State, and therefore took the strongest securities. The history of these quarrels and conflicts of the sixteenth century is exceedingly curious. The characters which pass before us, the stern covenanting principles on which they acted, the enthusiasm which anything in the shape of opposition (even to the disputing of a word or a name) enkindled, lend to the history of those times a wild and romantic aspect. But, as far as the records of those struggles between the Crown and the Church relate to the question which now agitates Scotland, we consider them "as an old almanack." They have just about the same influence and authority in the question of patronage, as the Queen's commission has in the General Assembly, whose functions have been described by Mr. Colquhoun in so ridiculous a light, that we should not wonder if the General Assembly should apply against another year to Madame Tussaud for a suitable figure, to be placed near the Moderator, who will, with the same wisdom as the person it represents, "fix the day for the next meeting, which the Moderator proclaims," and thus cover under "a politic (read waxwork) evasion, the defeat of the royal will and the triumph of the Church." Whatever may be said of the stern independence of the Church of Scotland, and however a competent person like Mr. Colquhoun may produce proof, from historical records, of the peculiar jurisdiction of the Church in the appointment of her ministers, we do not arrive at the facts which may fairly be said to influence the question of patronage until the restoration of Charles II. The right of patronage was exercised, without interruption, from about 1560 to the period of the Commonwealth; it was abolished in 1657, but was again restored in 1662.

The non-intrusionists of 1841 should take a lesson from the history of this brief period of five years, when the choice of the minister was transferred to the congregation. "The settlement of a new minister (says a grave historian) was dishonoured by in-

decent tumults, the rites were not unfrequently defiled with bloodshed, and the people were disfigured and dispersed by blows and wounds.”—(Malcolm Laing’s History of Scotland, vol. i. p. 499.)

When King William had put an end to the religious and civil commotions which agitated England, he sent a commissioner to Edinburgh, to adjust the complaints of the Assembly, and settle the difference between patrons and the Church. In 1690 patronage was again abolished, and the right of choosing ministers given to the people. “William complained with reason that his commissioner had exceeded his instructions* in abolishing patronage, which was properly no innovation upon the constitution of the Scottish Church.” It had subsisted as a right, though protested against as a grievance, from the beginning of the Reformation till the death of Charles I., when the choice of ministers was first transferred to the congregation, and their admission to the Presbytery on a popular election or call. The dissent of the congregation at the last period of abolition of patronage *was reviewed by the Presbytery.*—(Laing’s Hist. &c., as cited above.)

The Church having now obtained the patronage of all the benefices in Scotland, in 1690, continued to exercise her privilege until the Act of Queen Anne, in 1712. That Act restored to patrons the right of presenting clergymen to vacant churches in Scotland; upon which Sir Walter Scott has made some wise remarks, which we heartily wish our Scotch brethren would peruse, and imbibe their spirit of moderation. “Each mode of election (says that distinguished writer) is subject to its own particular disadvantages. The necessity imposed on the clergyman who is desirous of preferment of suiting his style of preaching to the popular taste, together with the indecent heats and intrigues which attend popular elections, are serious objections to permitting the flock to have the choice of their shepherd; at the same time the right of patronage is apt to be abused in particular instances, where persons of loose morals, slender abilities, or depraved doctrine, may be imposed by the fiat of an unconscientious individual upon a congregation who are unwilling to receive him. *But as the Presbyterian clergy possess the power of examination and rejection, subject to an appeal to the superior Church Courts, whatever may be thought of the law of patronage in theory, it has not, during the lapse of more than a century, had any effect in practice detrimental to the respectability of the Church of Scotland.*”—(History of Scotland, chap. lxxv.)

We sincerely hope that some considerate person may yet be

* See his instructions, State Tracts, iii. 460, “To establish that form of ecclesiastical government most agreeable to the people.”

found in "Auld Reekie," who will write up this paragraph out of "The Tales of a Grandfather," and post it up behind the Moderator at the next General Assembly. For one hundred and twenty-eight years has this law of patronage prevailed, and until within six years the word non-intrusion has never crossed the border. It is allowed, upon the whole, that patronage has been prudently and religiously exercised. It is not long since we heard of his Grace the Duke of Buccleuch calling in the aid of Dr. Chalmers to appoint a fit and proper person to some vacant church; and we ourselves have known many instances of a most conscientious discharge of a patron's duty. The questions which are very naturally asked by all persons on this side of the Tweed are, "What is the reason the Church of Scotland has begun *now* to agitate this question of patronage? What new thing has happened to cause such a commotion? If the people have really possessed a right to reject the patron's appointment, how comes it that they have kept it as a sword in the scabbard for more than a century? During the whole of the eighteenth century was there never a flagrant case, in which they might have brought the matter to an issue? Was there never a town or village disposed to assert the Church's independence, until it fell to the lot of Auchterarder in the year 1834? Was it necessary to wait until towards the middle of the nineteenth century before the 'unrighteous Act' of Queen Anne should be brought to a trial?" To all these interrogatories, which stupid members of the Church of England will ask, it is only replied, that the Church has often remonstrated, and for more than a century has been grieved by this system of intrusion.

Mr. Colquhoun cites eight cases which occurred during the eighteenth century (page 83). Eight cases in a hundred years, where the parishes rejected the patron's nominee! and although in some instances the Church, that is, the General Assembly, did not agree with the people, yet they sustained the objections. By which we understand, that, for the sake of peace and quietness, the patrons chose to waive their rights, and gave up their patronage. But if the Church had really wished to bring the matter to a trial, need she have waited for Auchterarder until 1834? We apprehend that all this disturbance has been occasioned by the great secession at the commencement of the present century. We ourselves recollect the late Dr. M'Crie observing, that if the question of patronage could be settled, i.e. by abolishing it, all the seceders would return to the Kirk. The non-intrusion question has its origin in an attempt to conciliate dissenters, a task as hopeless, we believe, in the north as in the south of England.

But we must proceed to other matter, and grapple with this grave question of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The General

Assembly declare, that it is their privilege and right, stamped with divine authority, as well as guaranteed by the State, to ordain and settle all ministers in parishes; and that if they see fit to refuse ordination to any candidate who may have been presented to a benefice, they have the clear and undoubted right of so doing. The civil courts say that the right of presentation is vested in the patron; that if the Assembly exercises its spiritual jurisdiction, it must be *exercised consistently with the patron's rights*. It has been decided in the civil court, and confirmed by the award of the highest court of judicature in the land, that the General Assembly has not the power, not the right, to reject a patron's nominee, unless he can be proved guilty of misconduct, or pronounced to be incompetent as to his attainments. The jurisdiction of the Church is limited by the interpretation of the law to the examination of the candidate's moral character and theological attainments; for to pronounce also upon his peculiar fitness for the particular parish to which he is nominated, invades, they say, the right of the patron. It is indeed equivalent to taking the patronage out of his hands, or, in other words, to deprive him of that which by law is his right. For one hundred and twenty-eight years he and his ancestors have been undisturbed in that right; but if the Church is to decide upon the peculiar fitness of the minister for that particular parish to which he has been nominated, the patron's right is virtually done away. Three qualifications, says Mr. Colquhoun, are required in the Church of England—letters, life, and doctrine. Four qualifications are required in the Church of Scotland—letters, life, doctrine, and *congeniality*. The whole of the question turns upon congeniality. This term is certainly quite new to our ecclesiastical vocabulary. Candidates for holy orders, with us, are men apt for their learning and godly conversation, and who are certified to have taught nothing “contrary to sound doctrine;” but that they should also be meet and apt for their *congeniality* is to us a novel qualification. We are not disposed, however, to quarrel with a word if we can discover its meaning; and for the sake of such of our readers as may not read the pamphlet, whose title is placed at the head of this article (which, however, we strongly recommend all persons desirous of knowing the real merits of the non-intrusion question to do), we will state, that congeniality means, a minister's peculiar suitableness to the particular parish to which he has been nominated by the patron. The patron's right to nominate nobody disputes; the church's right to enquire into letters, life, and doctrine, nobody disputes; but this congeniality! However learned may be the luckless nominee, however holy his walk and conversation, however sound and orthodox his doctrine; yet, if the heads of a rustic community shall declare to the Assembly that he is *un-*

congenial to the feelings or tastes of the villagers, the assembly must inform the patron that the nomination is void, and the parish again vacant. The civil courts of Scotland, supported by the decision of the House of Lords, declare that this is not law; that the Church cannot cripple and dispose of the rights of patrons of livings in this way. The General Assembly, which is bound to put all men in mind to obey magistrates and to submit to the powers that be, declares that it will not receive the legal decisions of those high courts of judicature. We, therefore, standing at a respectful distance from this conflict, can see nothing in it but a contest between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in which the latter declares that it shall be all one way; for to submit to the legal interpreters of the law they think would be to surrender the liberties of the Church, and render the General Assembly more profane than Esau. Upon this unchristian principle of resistance to "the powers that be," the General Assembly has excommunicated a whole presbytery for obeying the law of the land, asserting that the Church is above the law! The Assembly first embodies in its spiritual functions the administration of the temporalities of the Church, and then asks with great simplicity, if Christ be not the Head of the Church? And (if not in words, at all events, in actions,) if in Scotland, at least, the General Assembly be not Christ's vicar? The thunderbolt in the hands of the Gregories and the Innocents fell upon thrones and empires—in the hands of the Assembly it falls upon Strathbogie. Mr. Colquhoun hints that personal ruin awaits that refractory presbytery, (page 98). And the parish of Marnoch is threatened with the return of Mr. Henry.* We much regret that our limits will not permit us to enter fully into the merits of this question, but there is one strong argument used by the non-intrusionists, to which we are bound to give some attention; and this is the more incumbent upon us because we are willing to concede that the principle of "deference to the popular will" has been recorded in what Mr. Colquhoun calls, "the worst times of the Church," though he adds it was inoperative. Now this same principle is both recorded and acted upon in the Church of England: every time a candidate offers himself for ordination: a public notice called the *Si quis* is read in the parish church where the candidate resides, and where his character is supposed to be known, and the people are invited to send to the Bishop their objections, if they have any, against the admission of the candidate. Nor does this apply only to the sacred offices of Deacon and Priest. The same principle in another form is acted upon in the

* This gentleman was extruded from the church at Marnoch on January 3d, 1841, and the patron's nominee (Mr. Edwards) put into his place. We strongly recommend to all non-intrusionists a perusal of the Rev. Mr. Clark's (of Methven) Speech, delivered 27th January, 1841.

appointment of a Bishop, and this is all that is meant by the "consent of the people," to the appointment of pastors. (See Pamphlet, page 40.) The Church of Scotland has, however, given an additional privilege to the "*vox populi*." The parish which receives a nominated minister on trial, has the power theoretically of declaring to the Assembly that he does not suit their taste; but since this privilege, if really exercised, must necessarily lead to disorder and confusion (as it has done during the last six years) it was allowed to dwindle down into a mere form; and if two or three parishioners set their names to a paper approving of the candidate or nominee, *that* was considered an effective call—the rights of the patron were preserved, and the General Assembly nodded assent. This is just one of those innumerable fictions which are to be found in our ecclesiastical and civil polity—nay which, in some degree may be discovered in the passing of every act of parliament. Mr. Colquhoun knows as well as any one that the *Congè d'Elire* on the appointment of a Bishop is an anomaly. The Queen sends permission to a Dean and Chapter to elect a Bishop for the vacant diocese, and at the same time she recommends the person whom they are to elect. They proceed to all the forms of an election, and the lot falls upon the crown's nominee;—if it does not, the independent Dean and Chapter incur that most indescribable of all things, a *præmunire*. Now if a Dean and Chapter should allege that the person recommended by the crown was not suitable to their taste, and at all risks refuse to elect him, it is clear that in theory a very good case might be made out in justification of the honest Dean and Chapter; and that the invasion of the independence and the liberties of the Church might form a subject which would fill as many pamphlets as now cover our table on the question of non-intrusion. This is precisely what the Assembly is now doing, attempting to revive a principle which has long been inoperative, because impracticable. No longer permitting the call to be made out as a matter of form, they invite the parish to send them back the nominee, that they may pass him on to the patron. The *præmunire* incurred by the Assembly in this case is the loss of the Church revenues as it regards that parish, and consequently if this theory should be brought into general practice, the whole revenues of the Church of Scotland would be lost to the Church, and thus "*quicquid delirant reges plectuntur Achivi*," for the evil would fall upon the people. We know enough of the Scotch character in matters relating to their presbyterianism to be persuaded that if this power of rejection should be given them, there is scarcely a parish in Scotland that would not (at least for the first time) exercise it, and thus deprive the Church of all its temporalities. We ask then, is the General Assembly, in petitioning Parliament for the

abolition of patronage, prepared to give up the Church revenues? Has the Assembly taken any measures for supplying, by voluntary contributions, that of which it proposes to deprive every parish as a provision for the minister? If not, this is a mere contest for patronage, and a gigantic effort of the General Assembly to become virtually the patrons of all livings! The argument that the principle of power, vested in the popular will, to reject an appointment, has always been recorded, is worth nothing; for the real constitution of the Kirk of Scotland is that the popular will should only be expressed in a manner *consistent with* the patrons' rights. Besides, as Sir Walter Scott sensibly remarks, "the Presbyterian clergy possess the power of examination and rejection." Why then do they not at once reject the man whom they deem incapable of filling the office of the ministry? If it be replied that he may be fit for Auchterarder and not for Lethendy or Marnoch, we can designate such an objection by no other epithet than puerile. Imagine the Church of Dalmatia sending away Titus for uncongeniality, and Crescens returned from Galatia as not suitable; St. Paul himself having a veto from the Corinthians because his bodily presence was weak, and his speech (according to popular voice) contemptible! It is to us inexplicable how those distinguished persons, whose names we have been accustomed to venerate, should begin at the eleventh hour an agitation like that which now affects the whole of Scotland; alleging a right which has been allowed to sleep for more than a century, and passing the Veto Act of 1834, which the Assembly itself is now obliged to acknowledge was unconstitutional. Mr. Colquhoun undertakes to show (page 61) that the Act of 1834 was wholly without warrant. "The Act of 1834 may have been desirable," he adds (p. 65,) "it may have been politic, but it is without a precedent in the constitution of the Church of Scotland." We must take leave to say, with all respect to the author of the "Hints," that that which is wrong can never be either desirable or politic; and we are confident that the Hon. Member for Kilmarnoch would never say in his capacity of legislator, when an Act should be proposed inconsistent with the constitution, and without a precedent, that it could be either desirable or politic. We wish Mr. Colquhoun had taken higher ground here, and told the Assembly at once, 'You have passed an Act giving power to a parish against the patron, which you had no right to do; you have invaded the privileges of others by an enactment which is contrary to ecclesiastical as well as civil jurisdiction.'* We have not space left to pursue the history of the

* We are glad, however, to observe, that towards the close of the pamphlet Mr. Colquhoun has expressed his regret, in a foot note, that the Assembly should not have *performed their duty* in retracing their steps.

yet abortive attempts to adjust this question. Her Majesty's Ministers (we think wisely) have refused to deal with the matter in their official capacity; and it is now, we perceive, to be taken up by any Honourable Member who will maintain the broad principle of Non-intrusion, in the hopes of securing his next election. The Lord Chancellor has failed to adjust the matter, because he will not admit, and as we think most properly, of the fourth qualification of congeniality. Lord Aberdeen has failed to compose the differences, because he does not bar the review of the proceedings of the ecclesiastical by the civil courts; in other words because he does not, in his Bill, set the clergy above the law of the land. All attempts have yet failed, and the first Minister of the Crown has said that the existing laws must take their course. During the three hundred years of the Church of Scotland's existence, patronage has been exercised with two short interruptions; viz. from 1657 to 1662, and from 1690 to 1712, making together about twenty-seven years, and now petitions are being presented to Parliament to abolish it! Let this be done, and we venture to prophesy that the Sun of Scotland's Church is set. There is only one way we can see of saving that Church, as an establishment, from ruin; and that is, by some voluntary sacrifice on the part of the patrons, and some moderation on the part of the clerical agitators. On a living becoming vacant, we should like to see the patron exercise his rights, and appoint a new minister, whom the parish should be bound to take on trial for two months: the Presbytery should send a deputation twice (say once in each month,) to be present at the sermon, and if at the end of that period the parish considers the nominee uncongenial, the Presbytery should moderate, and have the power to reject the nominee; or in case of not agreeing with the parish, to send the matter to the Synod, whose decision in the first instance should be final. We would then have the patron to present a second person; and the same process should be adopted, the Synod moderating instead of the Presbytery; and in case of not agreeing with the parish, to refer the matter to the General Assembly, whose decision either way should be final. The patron should then exercise his right a third time, by presenting his nominee to the Assembly; and unless there were objections to his letters, life or doctrine, the Assembly should admit him, and send him to the fastidious parish. But this we apprehend is a remedy far too simple for an assembly of Scottish Presbyterians; nevertheless we venture to express a hope that Mr. Colquhoun will take to himself a few wise and moderate persons, and interfere at this crisis for the honour of true religion, and for the welfare, if not the very existence, of an Established Church in the Sister Kingdom.

SHORT NOTICES.

HELEN FLEETWOOD. By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. Foolscap octavo. London: *Seeley and Burnside*. 1841.

THIS is a most graphic and masterly exposure of the abominations of the factory system—a system, which has been no less prolific of evil to the free-born offspring of Britain, than the accursed slave-trade to the outraged sons of Africa. We might, were it suited to our limits, and compatible with the objects of our work, trace many features of resemblance in these kindred plagues of opposite hemispheres, but our attention is painfully fixed, by the work before us, upon one—the inadequacy of the most stringent regulations to do more than mitigate the evil. Legislation has indeed endeavoured to lighten the pressure of the chain—but the very aspect of thousands and of myriads in our manufacturing districts is sufficient to convince the most superficial observer, that it is still an “iron that entereth into the soul.”

We know it will be urged, by the advocates of the system, that the descriptions in the present work are greatly overcharged; that fiction is no authority; and that the writer of “Helen Fleetwood” has taken advantage of popular prejudice to produce a popular work. We will only therefore request the previous attention of our readers to one or two statements of facts, derived from a source which must sufficiently accredit them to every candid mind, the Report of the National Society for the year 1840; and descriptive of the moral condition of the juvenile population, in several of these overgrown manufacturing parishes. These are of themselves a conclusive answer to those who may charge the authoress of “Helen Fleetwood” with designed and gratuitous exaggeration.

“14. The district belonging to my Church contains a population of 5,000, and I regret to say that the children are in a state of *darkness and ignorance beyond description*; and if means are refused for extricating them from their present condition, they must remain a *disgrace to our Christian country*.”

“17. My chapelry contains nearly 12,000 inhabitants. I am extremely anxious for a school in the village of ——. It has in its vicinity nine factories, which employ a vast number of persons, and yet has no school in connexion with the Church; and as the

necessary result, the great mass of children in that locality are brought up in ignorance of Church principles."

" 41. I have lately come as curate into this parish, which contains nearly 5,000 inhabitants, chiefly occupied in the stocking trade; i. e. in working at stocking frames, and consequently very poor; and have *found infidelity, chartism, vice, and ignorance prevailing to a great extent.*"

" 5. — is a large and manufacturing district in the parish—population largely increasing—two large factories in constant operation. The inhabitants extremely poor; indeed, I may say, destitute. Until within the last few years there has been no church, schools, or pastoral superintendence, and the consequence is, that — *is a proverb for immorality and unconcern on religious subjects;—the ignorance of the great mass of the people is appalling.*"

We have extracted these cases from the applications made to the National Society by parochial clergymen, for aid in building Schools, in order to anticipate the only objection which could be advanced against this volume, as an exposure of the "factory system." It does nothing more than embody, in the lively and interesting form of narrative, facts which are thus attested by most competent witnesses, presented before a grave and authoritative tribunal, and subject to the strictest enquiry and investigation. But the book is something more, and something better, than an exposure of the factory system. It is a most touching and powerful development of Christian principle, as the main-spring of human action, under circumstances the most painful and disastrous; and though the catastrophe is among the deepest tragedies of common life which have ever come under our notice, the effect of the whole is soothing as well as saddening. The power which sustains the oppressed and outraged family, whose fortunes are here described, imparts something of its influence to the reader; and we rise from the perusal with the words of Holy Scripture in our remembrance, "Verily there is a reward for the righteous—doubtless there is a God that judgeth in the earth."

Nothing can be more natural and simple than the outline of the tale. A rural parish possesses a consequential churchwarden and a bustling overseer. These officials have fixed their evil eye on an industrious but poor family—consisting of an old woman, the grandmother, four children, from the ages of eight to eighteen, and Helen Fleetwood, an orphan, who has been brought up with them from infancy—as likely to become chargeable to the parish. In the absence of their parochial clergyman, who had ever been their counsellor and guide, and under whose ministrations they had

imbibed the wisdom that is above all price, they are persuaded, in an evil hour, to seek employment at the factories ; and carry thither a recommendation from the overseer, which is to place them at once in the possession of comfort, and to bring them into the road to opulence. Here commence the trials of Helen, a modest, amiable, and pious girl, just sixteen years of age—whom the Pastor had regarded as one of the choice lambs of his flock, and the Doctor had delighted to contemplate as the “beau-ideal of a village maiden—” trials, which heat the furnace of affliction seven times more than it is wont to be heated, but from which she comes forth refined as silver, and purified as gold, though the dross of the earthly material is evaporated in the process. Through much tribulation she enters into the kingdom of God.

We have nothing in this volume of what is called poetical justice. The oppressors live and flourish—the widow finds a shelter in the parish workhouse—the orphan in “the bosom of her Father and her God.” Richard, the eldest son, whom the clergyman had preserved from the fate of his family, by obtaining for him employment as an agricultural labourer ; and who had looked forward to a union with Helen, thus expresses the temporal result :—‘ We are a broken family, and the best and the brightest of us are no longer upon earth. You must not be surprised if I never get up my spirits as they used to be—for my thoughts are far away, in a better place than this ! ’

We cordially recommend this volume to our readers, and especially, though not exclusively, to the young. We have seldom met with a sketch of character more interesting—never with one more instructive, than that of Helen Fleetwood ; and if the book be read as extensively as it merits, it will have some influence in mitigating the evil of which it treats ; and will realize the wishes of the talented and gifted writer, by exciting the sympathies of Christians on behalf of “the perishing children of the poor.”

THE HOPE OF THE WORLD, *and other Poems.* By
CHARLES MACKAY. London: *Bentley.* 1840.

THE Author of this volume tells us that “he has but slight hopes that, among the multitude of verse-makers, he will shine out pre-eminent.” We do not think that he has formed too low an estimate of himself, so far as the collection of poems now before us is

concerned. But we think also, that looking to the blossom rather than the fruit, to the promise rather than the performance, he has done sufficiently well to deserve such encouragement, as the critical suffrage is competent to bestow. It is true, that in cultivating the "ancient simplicity," he has occasionally degenerated into feebleness; and that, consequently, in the midst of a passage from which we had expected much, we are sometimes interrupted and provoked by a line of downright insipidity. What we mean will be sufficiently indicated by the following couplets, taken from two consecutive pages (pp. 42, 43) :—

" We find, in spite of all the wonders done,
That man's improvement is but just begun : "

Again, we read of fairest climes, that are

" Beauteous and bright in trees, and flowers, and fruits,
But cursed with savage men, and savage brutes : "

Again, of the oppressed millions, who are

" doomed to sweat and moil,
And pass long days in harsh, incessant toil ;
Gaining hard bread, while bitterly they rue
That they are doomed to labour for the few. "

We really do not see how such passages can be entitled to the name of poetry at all. They hardly deserve even the character of measured prose. We may find many of a far more poetical cast in our prose translation of the Psalms. For example—

" In Judah is God known ; His name is great
In Israel, and in Salem is His seat.—
My soul, wait thou on God ; my expectation
Is all from Him, my rock and my salvation. "

Mr. Mackay must learn, before he publishes another collection, that lines of ten syllables are not necessarily heroic ; and that poetry does not regard rhyme as her associate, but as her hand-maid—not to be admitted into equal fellowship, but used only in servile ministry.

We must at the same time express our honest conviction, that this writer is possessed of talents, which are far from inconsiderable ; and it is a hopeful circumstance, that while his excellences are such as are capable of being cultivated, his faults are such as are readily susceptible of cure. There is no necessity for one to write such lines as we *have* quoted, who can produce such as we are now *about* to quote, taken, it must be observed, from the very same page. The passage is powerful in sentiment, forcible in expression, and, with the exception of one or two lines, stately and musical in

cadence ; reminding us, at times, of the full rich harmony of his classic model, Campbell ; in whose every line is a condensation of meaning, or a concentration of energy, or, at least, a thunder-peal of sound.

“ They err who say that man to grief is born,
That hopeless thousands are but made to mourn :
Heaven has not issued such a harsh decree—
Man’s is the guilt, as man’s the misery.
They are no dreamers who with steadfast hope
Comprise all nature in their love’s wide scope ;
And see afar that bright approaching day,
When human sorrows shall dissolve away.
There mild religion, breathing love and peace,
Still o’er the earth shall prosper and increase ;
And man become, no more in error blind,
The friend of man, the blessing of mankind ! ”

ECCLESIA ; a Volume of Poems. By the Rev. R. S. HAWKER, M.A., Vicar of Morwenstow. 8vo. Oxford. 1840.

THIS very handsome volume is merely a specimen, and that perhaps a favourable one, of the numerous imitators of Mr. Keble’s *Christian Year*. We are induced to notice it, on two grounds ;—first, that it is rather above the ordinary run of such productions ; and then, that it exhibits a clearer proof than most others, of the evil tendency of this style of thinking and writing.

It is called “ *Ecclesia*,” and rightly so called. Its subject is *the Church*, and nothing but the Church. But this is its condemnation. That thing, be it what it may, Church, or Sacraments, or Virgin, or Apostolic Fathers, which fills the mental eye, and shuts out CHRIST, is ruinous to man, and hateful to God.

Old Herbert sweetly sings—

“ Teach me, my God and King,
In all things Thee to see ;
And what I do in anything
To do it unto Thee.”

And in the same piece he adds—

“ A man who looks on glass,
On it may stay his eye :
Or, if he pleases, through it pass,
And all the heavens espy.”

Now our complaint of Mr. Hawker is, that while delighting himself in the Church, and Church ordinances, he ‘ stays his eye ’

on *them*, and does not 'through them pass,' to contemplate, with Stephen, the Lord of the Church, 'at the right hand of God.'

The natural consequence of this resting in the ordinances is, that those ordinances are prodigiously magnified in intrinsic worth and importance. A country church, is "the *awful* church;" its "gray fane," we are told, "might win an angel's gaze, amid the scenery of heaven." The font is "with baptism *bright*." In the Lord's supper, "a life unseen moves o'er that bread." The water of the other sacrament is, "the rain of God."

These exaggerations must necessarily sometimes overstep the bounds of sense or of discretion. Thus, in one place we are told that, "the sunbeams rain showers of *gold* through a *purple* pane." (p. 5.) In another, the cawing tenants of the church-steeple are designated "the birds of God," and their dwelling, "their *sacred* rest." Perhaps the worst piece of bathos is at p. 72, where "the changeless God's eternal fane," (i. e., a village church) receives "an added beauty," "a charm *immortal*." And what is that? gentle reader, tell. Why, truly, "the mind that shook whole senates hath been there!" In other words, the Bishop of Exeter has therein held a confirmation!

But nonsense, in things divine, is never harmless, or apart from evil. The heterodoxy of Mr. Hawker's verses is more conspicuous than their poetic beauty, indisputable as that sometimes is. How far short of direct and unequivocal Pelagianism is the doctrine of these four verses, occurring at different parts of the volume?

1. Of human *purity* :—

"Once on a time, my own sweet child,
There dwelt across the sea,
A lovely mother, meek and mild,
From sin and sorrow free."—(p. 12.)

This mother was the Virgin Mary, who was neither free from sin nor from sorrow. (Luke ii. 35.)

2. Of the same quality, in an infant at the font :—

"What fairer shrine can woo the God to rest,
Than the meek altar of that infant breast?"—(p. 43.)

This is said of the baptism of a child, who, like all other children of men, was "shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin."

3. In the same strain, to a lady :—

"They (the angels) glide along the lovely ground,
Where the first violet grows :—
Their graceful hands have just unbound
The zone of yonder rose!

I gather it for thy dear breast,
From stain and shadow free,
 That which an angel's touch hath blest,
 Is *meet*, my love, for thee!"—(p. 54.)

Whether "my love" is purer than Daniel or St. John may be doubted. But it was not thus that these holiest of God's saints used to speak of the angels of the Most High.

4. Lastly, here is an estimate of human *power* :—

"I will make my best endeavour,
 That my sins may be forgiven;
 I will serve God more than ever,
 To meet my child in heaven."—(p. 46.)

Of which the Homily of our Church teacheth us, that "although we hear God's word, and believe it; although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread, and fear of God within us; and do never so many good works thereunto; yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues and good deeds, as things that be far too weak and insufficient and imperfect to deserve remission of our sins; and must trust only on God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our Saviour Jesus Christ once offered for us on the cross." But Mr. Hawker tells us not one word of this; but represents the Cornish mother, without a word of correction on his part, as expecting to have her sins forgiven by virtue of her own "best endeavours," and to obtain heaven as the reward for "serving God."

Such is one, and by no means, the worst, of the school of poets which Mr. Keble has mainly contributed to form! The usual inconsistency of error marks the conduct of the patrons of this school. Should any one betray a fear lest the honour paid to Mary should overpass the bounds of safety or propriety, and in that fear, doubt the expediency of giving her the favourite designation of "The Mother of God;"—immediately a cry of "*heresy!*" is heard, and the council of Ephesus is appealed to. But if, instead of the honour of the Virgin, it should be *only* the honour of the Lord Jesus Christ that should be assailed; and if all the danger is, *merely* that human nature should be elevated to purity and power, and thus men become *their own Saviours*;—do we hear anything of "heresy," then? Oh, no! the glowing zeal of these gentlemen for orthodoxy only shews itself when any of the inventions of the fifth century are attacked:—if the assault be only upon some of the doctrines of the New Testament, there is little interest exhibited in the matter.

THE CENTURIONS ; *or, Scripture Portraits of Roman Officers.*
 London : Seeley and Burnside. 1840.

THIS pleasing and instructive little work is another proof of the inexhaustible character of the Scripture mine. It presents a new line of thought ; and one on which the mind may dwell with surprise and enlargement. Our ideas of the heathen world are necessarily vague ; being formed from a few leading features ; without the opportunity of observing the finer lights and shades. But a study like that which this volume offers, will soften and moderate our harsher conclusions.

The writer, in passing through the New Testament history, remarks five leading portraits of Roman officers ; and, until thus singled out, no one would have anticipated that the group, when massed together, would have presented so many attractive and edifying features.

We have first, the Centurion at the Crucifixion, who “ *glorified God,*” exclaiming “ *Truly this was the Son of God ;*”—certainly “ *this was a righteous man.*” And we know that it is a scriptural truth, that “ *No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.*”

Next, we have the chief captain Lysias ; who is distinguished, as our author observes, “ in the courtesy which he showed to Paul, permitting him first to address the people, then to be at liberty in the castle, and to enjoy free intercourse with his relations and friends ; in his attendance at the trial to see that the apostle met with fair treatment ; in the gentle and encouraging manner in which he took the young man aside to speak with him ; in the care with which he provided for Paul’s comfort on the journey to Cæsarea ; and in the good-humoured readiness with which the centurions under him acquiesced in the wishes of their prisoner.”—(p. 48.)

The third instance is that of the Centurion Julius, who “ *entreated Paul courteously ;*” and who evidently, in the midst of dangers, had set his heart on the apostle’s safety.

We return, for the fourth instance, to Capernaum, where we meet with the centurion in behalf of whom the Jews besought our Lord, saying, “ *that he was worthy ; for he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue,*” and of whom Christ testified, “ saying, “ *Verily, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith ; no, not in Israel.*”

Lastly, all will remember Cornelius, “ *who feared God with all*

“ his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always ;” and whose supplications brought down a heavenly messenger, specially to direct him to the apostle of the Lord Jesus.

Surely, even this hasty glance will satisfy our readers that the subject, strange, as it might at first appear, was one deserving a distinct consideration. And we shall only add, that the author has done full justice to it.

SCRIPTURAL GROUNDS OF UNION, *considered in Five Sermons.* Preached before the University of Cambridge in the month of November, 1840. By the Rev. JAMES SCHOLEFIELD, A.M., Regius Professor of Greek. London: *Parker and Seeleys.* 1840.

WE have heard it observed, that these Sermons disappointed, in a degree, those previous expectations which had been founded upon the high reputation of the writer, coupled with the grave importance of the subject. If the fact were so, the cause of the disappointment must be traced to the unreasonableness of the expectations themselves. Professor Scholefield is cast in the intellectual mould which qualifies a man to grapple with difficulties, but not to accomplish impossibilities—and an impossibility it would be to compress within the compass of Five Discourses such an extent and variety of argument, as must be required to explore all the subtleties and expose all the fallacies of the system which, as Select Preacher, he felt it his solemn obligation to withstand. To do this would, as he justly observes, “ require more space than would have been consistent with the form in which the investigation was brought forward.” But what he *has* done, he has done effectually. Considering “ Scriptural grounds of union ” first, generally—and then with special reference to the Son of God, to the doctrine of Justification, to the work of the Holy Spirit and to the sufficiency of the word of God, he has at least exhibited to Christian students “ large and simple views of the grand elements of Christian truth, and inclined them to turn away with instinctive dislike from sophistries which might otherwise entangle them in pernicious error.” He has at least lopped away a limb, if he has not pierced the monster to the heart; and we have only to desire for him another encounter, and an equal success.

We will not undertake, within the limits of a brief notice, to afford any analysis of these masterly discourses, which are designed for a more extensive perusal than might be supposed from the character of the auditory to which they are immediately addressed. With enough of the classical learning to sustain the academical reputation of writer, they contain much cogent and conclusive argument which must be intelligible, and cannot but be profitable, to every class of readers. We will exhibit one or two specimens of these, which we are fully persuaded will create an appetite for more.

“Who can witness without grief and amazement that awful tampering with Popish idolatry, exhibited in the republication of the abominations of the Roman Breviary. (Tracts for the Times, No. 75.) Is idolatry a thing so harmless, that youthful and imaginative minds may safely be familiarized with its poison, and *that* too so subtilly mixed up with truth, that it will be the more likely to pass unobserved and unsuspected? The apology for this is, that as “our own daily service is formed upon the Breviary, it may suggest character and matter for our *private* devotions, over and above what our Reformers have thought fit to adopt into our public services;” and this, it is said, will only be carrying out and completing what they have begun. Now, will it not be rather *undoing what they have done?* For they retained the sound doctrine, and reject the error; and we, it seems, shall complete their design by *re-producing the error and incorporating it with the truth.*”

With a censure like this, as reasonable as it is severe, we think that No. 75 of the “Tracts” is not likely to produce much evil effect among the young academics of Cambridge, however diffusive the poison, and however concentrated the antidote. We consider, nevertheless, that the fourth and fifth discourses of the Series are more especially valuable in the present state of the controversy. In the former of these, Professor Scholefield grinds to powder the monstrous assertion of Mr. Newman, of which the terms are as irreverent as the substance is unscriptural. “The meaning of Scripture is not so distinct and prominent as to force itself on the minds of the many. We would not deny that a religious, wise, and intellectually-gifted man will succeed, but the *chances* are seriously against a given individual.” Of course it would be quite superfluous, if “the Church is to be the interpreter of the bible,” and Mr. Newman the mouth-piece of the Church, to mention such an antiquated personage as David, who “understood more than the ancients, because the testimonies of God were his meditation;” but the course of Mr. Newman’s own reading might, at least, have

put the bridle of Chrysostom upon his mouth, who saith, "that man's human worldly wisdom is not needful to the understanding of the scripture, but the revelation of the Holy Ghost, who inspireth the true meaning into them, that with diligence and humility do search there." (Homily I. on Reading the Scripture.)

But the Professor has arranged, and wisely, that his most effective stroke should be the last. He has met the Tractarians, where his peculiar acquirements found their vantage-ground, on the question of Tradition; and how he has acquitted himself in the contest, the following extract may speak. How the home thrust which it exhibits is to be parried, the opponents must determine for themselves. We do not expect that the Professor's searching questions can be *answered*—we only wish that the advocates of the semi-popish system would *attempt* a reply. If they *did* so, then, to use the language of their own Coryphæus, "to see where they shall end if they go forward, may through God's mercy persuade them to go back."

"'The unwritten word of God,' they say, 'if it can be any how authenticated, demands the same reverence from us' with his written word. True; but the question immediately arising is, How can it be authenticated? You cannot examine it, you cannot compare it with any recognized standard, you must take it upon trust; and in trusting it you can have no possible security, that you will not be either misled by mistaken men, or deceived by designing men.

"While they boast therefore on the other side, 'Our foundation is antiquity,' we might well be content to answer, And ours is the Word of God. But in comparing their foundation and ours, we may proceed farther. and ask upon their own principles, Why not go up at once to the highest antiquity, to the very fountain of Revelation itself, where all is pure and unmixed with error, instead of arguing as if the streams from that fountain had gone on purifying in their course, till we come through successive stages of improvement to the golden age of the 'three fully instructed doctors, Athanasius, Basil, and Ambrose'? Their answer is, that we cannot agree in interpreting Scripture. Perhaps not; but by coming three or four centuries downward what do you gain? First of all, you find the streams polluted with error, and the truth of God mixed with human opinions: next, you will find at that distance from the original revelation discrepancies in interpreting the word: then you have the difficulty and uncertainty about the sense of these interpreters themselves: and if you attempt to set up against this the rule of general consent of Fathers, you come to the final difficulty of ascertaining and gathering up these precious fragments of truth, so stamped with the seal of universal agreement, and the impossibility of this investigation to the bulk of those whom it vitally concerns. And while we are going about to clear away these and similar difficulties, the sense of mankind and the spiritual cravings of souls hungering for bread will take a shorter way to the supply of pressing exigencies, and say, But here is God's own revelation of his own mind and will: why not search and find it here?—And is it the object of this system, to make truth inaccessible to the multitude?

On the whole then, we scruple not to express our decided opinion, that in this resolute encounter with errors of which the peril is in exact proportion to the plausibility, Professor Schole-

field, as the Select Preacher of Gospel truth to an academic audience, has acquitted himself worthily and well. If he has not done all that the crisis required, he has done all that circumstances allowed—and afforded the most satisfactory promise for the future, in the performance of the past. We only wish that his ‘field of fight’ had been commensurate with the twenty discourses of the Hulsean Lecturer—he might then have completed what he has now so well begun; he might then have wielded the Sword of the Spirit with such effect, as not only to disable, but decapitate the foe. One advantage however is gained which we cannot too highly estimate—the reading of these discourses will of itself suffice to unmask “the false apostle,” though he “transforms himself into an Angel of Light.”

A CHARGE *delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Ely, at a Visitation held in St. Michael's Church, Cambridge.* By the Rev. J. H. BROWNE, M.A., Archdeacon of Ely, Rector of Cotgrave, &c. 8vo. Hatchard. 1840.

HAVING lately devoted some space to two Archidiaconal Charges, we must dismiss the present one with a brief notice. And we do so the more willingly, inasmuch as its leading feature,—“*Strictures on the Oxford Tract System*,”—is one which we could not profitably discuss in so incidental a mode. We shall therefore only say, that the present, like the former of Archdeacon Browne's Charges, is devoted to doctrinal instruction; and, in this respect, differs from the ordinary run of such productions. His official addresses form a valuable series of Theological Lectures, on the fundamental doctrines of the Church of England; and the present one is by no means the least interesting or the least important of the series.

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1841.

THE HOPE OF CHRISTIAN PARENTS FOR THEIR BAPTIZED CHILDREN. By HENRY SYLVESTER RICHMOND, A.M., of Queen's College, Cambridge; Curate of Denton, near Canterbury. London: *Hatchards*. 1841.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION *shown to be the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolical Church of England, by a Chain of Extracts from the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgies.* Carlisle: *Thurnam*. 1840.

THESE are two of the latest productions which have fallen in our way, on that *vexata questio*—the baptismal-regeneration controversy. The first of them, a Sermon by a son of the deservedly-venerated LEIGH RICHMOND, is one of the most successful attempts which we have seen, to reconcile the Church, and Scripture, with notorious and undeniable fact. Our present purpose, however, is, not to enter upon this thorny path, but rather to protest against the whole controversy, as recently carried on, believing it to be nothing else than one of the most refined of the devices of Satan.

Some, possibly, may start at the idea of so describing a grave and serious discussion on a point of doctrine, held, or supposed to be held, by our own Church; but let such remember, that the Tempter cares not whether his baits be selected from profane or from sacred sources; that the disguise of an angel of light is one of his favourite metamorphoses; and that not even the most constant student of God's word can expect to cope with him, either in the knowledge of Holy Scripture, or in an adroit and plausible application of it. His greatest triumphs have ever been obtained in the field of religious controversy; and his favourite employment consists, not in rooting up the divine seed—that he is not permitted

to do—but in “sowing tares among the wheat,” which “choke the word,” and render it unfruitful.

Our impression, then, is, that he has been more than usually active in this work, among the members of our Church, in the present day; and that his grand effort has been to raise a cloud of fictions, theories, and hypotheses, by the shadow and darkness of which the great REALITIES upon which man's salvation depends, might be wholly, or almost wholly, excluded from our view.

Let us endeavour to recal to mind those Realities; and let us see if even a brief contemplation of them is not sufficient to reduce the controversies of the day to their appropriate insignificance.

What is the state of man, then, in general? Not of man in a condition of heathenism, barbarized or civilized, but of the men among whom we live, the human race in Christendom; and not in Christendom merely, but in enlightened England? What is, spiritually, the general, the ordinary state of man, in this, the most favoured series of circumstances under which he has ever been placed?

It is a state of alienation from God; of constant disobedience to His laws; of unceasing endeavour to forget or deny His existence. It is a state of *ungodliness*: it is a living “*without God in the world.*”

Not to leave ourselves open to the charge of giving a “party view” of the case, we will quote, from Mr. Newman's recent volume of *Sermons*, the representations which he unhesitatingly makes, of the state of that portion of mankind amongst whom we live:—

“Take the world as it is, with its intelligence, its bustle, its feverish efforts, its works, its results, the ceaseless ebb and flow of the great tide of mind: view society, I mean, not in its adventitious evil, but in its essential characters, and what is all its intellectual energy but a fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil?” &c. &c.

“What a dreadful thought it is, that there may be numbers outwardly in the Christian Church, nay, who are at present in a certain sense religious men, who nevertheless have no principle of growth in them, because they have sinned, and have never duly repented.”

“Nothing is more clearly brought out in Scripture, or more remarkable in itself, than this, that in every age, out of the whole number of persons blessed with the means of grace, *few* only have duly availed themselves of this great benefit.”

“A most awful thought it is, that out of the whole number of those who have received the Christian calling, out of ourselves and our friends, and all whom we see and hear of in the intercourse of life, *but a few* are chosen; *but a few* act up to their privileges.”*

We are agreed, then, even with the stoutest assertors of what is called “baptismal justification,” in our view of the state of the

* *Rev. J. H. Newman's Sermons*, vol. v. pp. 130, 221, 289, 297.

world; of the state of the mass of baptized men, in this the centre of the light and life of Christendom.

But to approach, if possible, a little closer to the facts;—let us suppose it practicable to institute a moral census of our population; or even of such a specimen of it as we might take up in one of our crowded metropolitan thoroughfares, from the beginning to the end of the year. Imagine the first hundred men that might pass, in any given hour, at Charing-cross, to be compelled to make a candid disclosure of their pursuits, hopes, desires, fears, and objects in life. Some would be found hurrying after the mere senseless increase of their already unenjoyed hoards of wealth; others, after some desired honour or distinction; many after sensual pleasures and animal gratifications; and the most of all, probably, after the customary supply of daily wants, by the daily routine of bodily labour. But how many, among the number, would be able with sincerity to declare, that they were living “*as those who were not their own, but were bought with a price;*” and were labouring to glorify their Redeemer, “*with their bodies and their spirits, which were His?*” Will any one accustomed to mingle in, and examine the component parts of human society,—will such an one declare it to be in his opinion probable, that so many as ten of the hundred should be found to answer this description? Will he not rather say, that it ought to be no matter of surprise if not even *five* out of the whole mass should appear to be Christians in more than in name! Of the rest, the Apostle’s description would be scarcely overcharged, when he speaks of such as were “*serving divers lusts and pleasures; living in malice and envy; hateful, and hating one another.*” Yet let us remark, that while we should indubitably find, on such a scrutiny, that Mr. Newman was fully justified in asserting, that “*of the whole number of persons blessed with the means of grace, few only have availed themselves of this great benefit;*”—there is little doubt that we should also find that at least ninety or ninety-five out of the hundred had been duly and canonically *baptized*; and in so far as baptism is regeneration, had been actually *regenerated*!

But, being thus entirely agreed as to the moral condition of the great bulk of those who are called Christians, let us ask, in the next place, whether this state of things is not a fearful one, as it respects the parties themselves; i.e. *the great bulk of the world around us.*

And in what consists its fearfulness and its danger? Not merely or chiefly in this,—that men offend the God who will one day be their Judge, day by day and hour by hour. This is an awful consideration; but its force is put aside by the idle answer, that

"God is merciful, and will not be extreme to mark what is done amiss." We therefore prefer to rest upon the further view,—that the corruption of man's nature, in this life, makes him, while remaining unchanged, altogether inapt and incompetent to experience anything else than misery in the life to come.

Wolfe, in one of the best of his sermons, has most forcibly expressed this great truth. He says:—

"Heaven is not a theatre, that shifts the scene to suit itself to every foolish fancy and every silly humour of the spectators. It has, indeed, its fulness of joy and its pleasures for evermore; but the question is, have we the power and the relish to enjoy them? We will suppose, for a moment, that our hope of going to heaven is, some way or other, fulfilled, and that (God knows how) we have passed the fearful account that we shall have to render,—of sins committed, of duties neglected, of blessings abused, of time squandered away; we will suppose that we have found our way into that heaven that is the object of our hopes:—what have we to promise ourselves? We know at least what we shall *not* find there; we know that "naked as we came into this world, naked shall we go out of it;" that the body which held *us* and the earth together is laid in the dust from which it was taken; and the bond that united us to this lower world is snapped, and the channel through which we communicated with it withdrawn; and this busy stage, upon which our affections have been running to and fro, seeking rest and finding none, is at once concealed from our view, and becomes to us a dead blank. Alas, alas! what objects shall we fasten upon to fill up the dreary vacancy which was once occupied by our busy pursuits and our dear pleasures upon earth? For the gold and the silver are gone, and the pipe and the viol and the tabret have died away in silence. What shall we seize upon to employ our minds, or to interest our hearts, or to excite our desires, or to fill up our conversation? Alas! where is the buying and selling, the bustle of business, or the enthusiasm of enterprise, that supplied us at once with our cares and our hopes? Where is the flowing goblet, and the wild and wanton merriment, that used to set the table in a roar? Alas, alas! what shall we do for the delightful trifles by which we contrived, while we were upon the earth, to get rid of time, and forget that it was rolling over our heads? What shall we do for those wild pursuits by which we made ourselves mad for a time, and haunted eternity out of our minds? What shall we do for conversation—upon what subjects shall we converse? And then—to go on in this way for ever! and for ever! and for ever! We cannot sit thus dreaming through eternity. If this be heaven, would to God he had left us still upon our beloved earth! Wherefore have ye brought us out of Egypt, where we ate and drank and were merry, and have left us here to perish in the wilderness? Better would it have been for us to have still our interchanges of hope and fear, of pleasure and pain, of repose and fatigue, of joy and sorrow, than to endure this dismal serenity—than to say in the morning, 'would God it were evening; and in the evening, would God it were morning.' "

Here, then, we find one of the great Realities on which the attention of men ought to be fixed. The truth, the fact of man's natural inaptitude to experience aught but misery in a future state, being incontrovertible, we arrive at the conviction, that one thing is needful and indispensable to every sinner, and it is that of which the Lord so explicitly and emphatically declared to Nicodemus,—
"YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN."

The Christian, not in name merely, but in reality,—is one upon whom a miracle has been wrought. He is one “*whose heart the Lord has opened*,” in a way in which other men’s hearts are not opened. He thus becomes one of “*a peculiar people*,” of whom Mr. Newman himself thus speaks:—

“A change has come over them, unknown to themselves, indeed, except in its effects; but they have a portion in destinies which other men have not; and, as having destinies, they have conflicts also.” *

The grand question then is, How this change is ordinarily wrought? To what agency ought our attention to be principally directed, as likely to lead to such all-important results?

So far as Scripture proceeds, in the history of the present dispensation, its reply to this enquiry is sufficiently clear. The three thousand, on the day of Pentecost, “*when they HEARD*” Peter’s Sermon, “*were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do?*” (Acts ii. 37.) Again, shortly after, on another occasion, “*many of them which HEARD the word believed, and the number of the men was about five thousand.*”—(Acts iv. 4.) In consistency with this Divine method, the angel’s instructions to the apostle were, “*Go, stand and SPEAK in the temple to the people, all the words of this life,*”—(Acts v. 20.) Accordingly, when “*scattered abroad*,” the disciples “*went everywhere PREACHING THE WORD.*” To the eunuch, “*Philip opened his mouth, and PREACHED unto him Jesus.*” To Cornelius, Peter “*opened his mouth, preaching peace by Jesus Christ,*” and “*while Peter spake, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.*” The whole book of the Acts of the Apostles proceeds in the same strain. Everywhere the work of the first preachers of the gospel is exhibited as being precisely the same which the Lord himself had described to St. Paul. “*I send thee to the Gentiles, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God; that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified, BY FAITH that is in me.*”—(Acts xxvi. 18.)

This great work is effected in a variety of ways. Since the invention of printing, it has often been carried on by the instrumentality of books. But, in whatever particular mode the Spirit of God may please to operate, the result, in the vast majority of cases, is, *a change of heart, produced by the entrance of truth, with Divine power, into the understanding.*

Concerning the chief mass of the truly converted, it necessarily happens, from the obscurity of their lives, that nothing is known,

* Newman’s Sermons, vol. v. p. 335.

except to their nearest connexions, of the internal history of their souls. Occasionally, however—and chiefly in the case of those who subsequently become the means of “turning many to righteousness”—some record is preserved of the nature and particulars of the change wrought in them. And from these instances we may fairly deduce some conclusions as to the remaining mass. Let us open the personal narratives of one or two of these men, and see what are the details they have left for our instruction.

We may begin with Franké, for instance, the founder of the orphan house at Halle ; who, after having been a student of divinity for about seven years, and having advanced to the threshold of the ministry, was arrested by divine grace in the following remarkable manner :—He was called on to preach a kind of probationary sermon, and his mind was led to the text, “*These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through his name.*” He says :—

“My intention in selecting this text was, to treat of true and living faith, and how it is distinguished from a mere human and imaginary belief. Whilst revolving the subject in my mind, with all seriousness, I felt that I myself was still devoid of that faith, which would be required in my sermon. I therefore relinquished meditating upon the sermon, and found enough to do with myself.” “The whole of my former life presented itself to my view, like the prospect of a large city from a lofty tower. First of all, I was able to number, as it were, my sins; but soon the principal source from which they sprang unfolded itself;—I mean unbelief, or a mere imaginary faith, with which I had hitherto deceived myself.” “At one time I wept, at another I walked up and down in great distress; then fell upon my knees and called upon him whom I knew not; and said, that if there was really a God, I besought him to have pity on me; and this I did frequently, and in various ways. One Sunday, I reflected upon the propriety of declining the invitation to preach, if no change manifested itself, because I could not preach against my conscience, nor deceive the people with respect to my state. For I felt too perceptibly what it was to have no God to whom the heart could cleave; to weep over one’s sins, and not know why, or who it was that caused such tears to flow, and whether there really was a God, whom we had offended by our sins; and daily see our misery and wretchedness, and yet know of no Saviour and no place of refuge. It was in such anguish of soul as this, that on the Sunday above mentioned I again knelt down, and called upon that God and Saviour whom I knew not, nor believed in, for deliverance from my wretched state,—if there really was a God and Saviour. And the Lord heard me.”

Next we may turn to Dr. Buchanan, the “re-edifier,” so to speak, of our Church in India. He himself tells us of his early life—

“Since my coming to London, until June last, I led a very dissipated, irreligious life. Some gross sins I avoided; but pride was in my heart; I profaned the Lord’s day without restraint, and never thought of any religious duty.” But in that month, “on a Sunday evening, a gentleman of my acquaintance called upon me. I knew him to be a serious young man, and out of complaisance to him I gave the conversation a religious turn. Among other things, I asked him whether he believed that there was such a thing as divine grace; whether or not it was a fiction invented by grave and austere

persons, from their own fancies. He took occasion, from this inquiry, to enlarge much upon the subject; he spoke with zeal and earnestness, and chiefly in scripture language, and concluded with a very affecting address to the conscience and the heart. I had not the least desire, that I recollect, of being benefited by this conversation; but while he spoke, I listened to him with earnestness; and before I was aware, a most powerful impression was made upon my mind, and I conceived the instant resolution of reforming my life. On that evening I had an engagement which I could not now approve: notwithstanding what had passed, however, I resolved to go; but as I went along, and had time to reflect on what I had heard, I half wished that it might not be kept. It turned out as I desired. I hurried home, and locked myself up in my chamber; I fell on my knees, and endeavoured to pray, but I could not. I tried again, but I was not able. I thought it was an insult to God for *me* to pray. I reflected on my past sins with horror, and spent the night I know not how."

Such was the nature and character of the change in Buchanan's mind.

"It was initial, indeed," says Dean Pearson, "but it was radical; it was imperfect in degree, but universal as to its objects and influence. It not only redeemed him from a sinful and worldly course, but gradually introduced him to a state of 'righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.' It rendered him, in short, 'a new creature.' He felt the powerful influence of the love of Christ; and cordially acquiescing in the unanswerable reasoning of the great Apostle, 'that if one died for all, then were all dead,' he resolved no longer to live unto himself, 'but unto him that died for him and rose again.'"

The narrative of Mr. Scott, the commentator, differs from the above solely in the slower progress of the change, but not at all in its reality or extent. He writes of himself, that in 1772,

"With a heart full of pride and wickedness; my life polluted with many unrepented, unforsaken sins; without one cry for mercy, one prayer for direction or assistance, or for a blessing upon what I was about to do; after having concealed my real sentiments under the mask of general expressions; after having subscribed articles directly contrary to what I believed; and after having blasphemously declared, in the presence of God and of the congregation, in the most solemn manner, sealing it with the Lord's Supper, that I judged myself to be 'inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take that office upon me,'—not knowing or believing that there was any Holy Ghost,—I was ordained a deacon."

And in 1779 he thus writes to his sister:—

"It has pleased the Lord, through my study of his word, with prayer for that teaching which he hath promised, to lead me to a different view of the gospel of Jesus Christ than I had embraced: and not only so, but to lead me from seeking the favour of the world, and my own glory, to seek God's favour, aim at his glory, and derive happiness from him. A happiness I have therein tasted to which I was before a stranger: that *peace of God which passeth all understanding*, and which as much excels, even in this world, any thing I had before experienced, as the cheering constant light of the noonday sun exceeds the short-lived glare of a flash of lightning, which leaves the night more dark and gloomy than before."

In the case of Mr. Legh Richmond, the entrance of divine light was almost instantaneous.

"One of his college friends, who was on the eve of taking holy orders, had received from a near relative Mr. Wilberforce's 'Practical View of Christianity.' This thoughtless candidate for the momentous charge of the Christian ministry forwarded the book to Mr. Richmond, requesting him to give it a perusal, and to inform him what he must say respecting its contents. In compliance with this request, he began to read the book, and found himself so deeply interested in its contents, that the volume was not laid down until the perusal of it was completed. The night was spent in reading and reflecting upon the important truths contained in this valuable and impressive work. In the course of his employment, the soul of the reader was penetrated to its inmost recesses; and the effect produced in innumerable instances by the book of God, was in this case accomplished by means of a human composition. From that period his mind received a powerful impulse, and was no longer able to rest under its former impressions. A change was effected in his views of divine truth, as decided as it was influential. He was no longer satisfied with the creed of the speculatist—he felt a conviction of his own state as a guilty and condemned sinner, and under that conviction he sought mercy at the cross of the Saviour."

His own account of the circumstance is as follows:—

"To the unsought and unexpected introduction to Mr. Wilberforce's book on 'Practical Christianity,' I owe, through God's mercy, the first sacred impression which I ever received, as to the spiritual nature of the gospel system, the vital character of personal religion, the corruption of the human heart, and the way of salvation by Jesus Christ. As a young minister, recently ordained, and just entrusted with the charge of two parishes in the Isle of Wight, I had commenced my labours too much in the spirit of the world, and founded my public instructions on the erroneous notions which prevailed amongst my academical and literary associates. The scriptural principle stated in the 'Practical View' convinced me of my error; led me to the study of the Scriptures with an earnestness to which I had hitherto been a stranger; humbled my heart, and brought me to seek the love and blessing of that Saviour, who alone can afford a peace which the world cannot give."

"To this incident I was indebted, originally, for those solid views of Christianity on which I rest my hope for time and eternity."

Instances such as these might be multiplied by thousands. We have adduced these few in order fully to explain and establish the fact, that after a moral and religious education, and even after a training for, and admission to, holy orders, the state of the man may be that which our Saviour describes in those awful words, "*Ye have no life in you.*" With still greater certainty, then, may we assume this to the case with those multitudes of nominal Christians who form the great bulk of our population; and who, beyond a Sunday's attendance at church, make no attempt even to pass for religious men.

In these instances we see, also, not only the state of the men when apprehended by divine grace,—a state described in Scripture as "*dead in trespasses and sins*;"—but we see also what was required to bring them out of that state, and to "*fill them with all joy and peace in believing*," enabling them to "*abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost.*" Through the instrumentality of his own word, or by the lips of a preacher, or from

the pages of a book, the Holy Spirit caused them to see their own danger, as lost and ruined by sin ; and the only remedy provided, in the righteousness of Christ, which "*is unto all and upon all them that believe.*" These two great realities being once thoroughly received into the mind and heart, not as notions or theories merely, but as the most important *facts* that could possibly come to a man's knowledge ; the natural, the *inevitable* result is, an entire change in his whole life and conduct,—just as great a change, if he be thoroughly awakened, as would be seen in a man aroused from his sleep at midnight by the warning that his house was on fire. In each case, the transition is, from dreams and dangerous slumber, to cries of "What must I do to be saved?" and struggles to escape. And this is precisely the point to which the ministers of the gospel among us, should be constantly striving to bring that great majority of their hearers whom they know to be fast asleep in their sins. To prevent this, accordingly, is Satan's grand business in a Christian land. And his latest and most refined device is that of which we have spoken at the beginning of this article ; namely, to turn this whole question into a matter of controversy, and to get up a "strife of words" in order to draw off men's attention from the real question. And in this, as in all similar matters, he finds no difficulty in making religious men his most efficient agents.

"Regeneration," says a leader of one party,—"*Oh, yes!—regeneration is essential, is the all-important thing. But then, the Church teaches that regeneration takes place at baptism ; and scripture agrees with this, for it speaks of "the washing of regeneration."*

An earnest man on the other side, seeing at a glance that this view makes regeneration either useless or inaccessible to more than nineteen-twentieths, (to say the least) of his people,—inasmuch as they *have been* baptized, and are still "in their sins,"—at once denies the position. He is then perplexed with the language of the Church catechism,—"*Wherein (at my baptism) I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, &c.*"

Another comes to his aid with this solution :—Augustine tells us, that "if sacraments had not a certain similitude of those things whereof they be sacraments, they should be no sacraments at all. And for this similitude, they do for the most part receive the names of the self-same things they signify." Agreeably with which Bishop Jewell argues, that "we must consider that the Fathers, in their treatises of the sacraments, sometimes use the outward sign instead of the thing signified ; sometimes, the thing signified instead of the sign."

Dr. Pusey, however, will by no means allow of this escape. His statement of the doctrine is quite transcendental.

"All their old sins had been forgiven, and they themselves re-born from the dead, and been made partakers of the life of Christ, "quickened with Him:" the powers of darkness had been spoiled of their authority over them, and exhibited as captors and dethroned. All these things had been bestowed upon them by baptism; the mercies of God had been there appropriated to them; sins blotted out; *their sinful nature dead*, buried in Christ's tomb; death changed into life; and therefore, as they had no need, so neither were they to make void these gifts by trusting in any other ordinances, or looking to any other Mediator. St. Paul dreads that through false teaching and a false self-abasement, they should not hold to the Head (ver. 18). But does he depreciate their baptismal privilege? or, because they were tempted to lean on circumcision, does he disparage outward ordinances? or dread that the exaltation of the ordinance should lead to a depreciation of Christ? Rather, he shows them how *every thing* which they sought, or *could need*, was comprised, and *had been already bestowed upon them* in their Saviour's gift, in His ordinance: that this ordinance was no mere significant rite, but contained within itself the stripping off of the body of sin, death, resurrection, *new life*, forgiveness, annulment of the hand-writing against us, despoiling of the strong one, triumph over the powers of darkness. We also have been thus circumcised, have been buried, raised, *quickened*, pardoned, *filled with Christ*: all this God has done for us."^{*}

Bishop Bethell, however, another "standard author" on this subject, espouses a totally different theory. He maintains that the solution of the difficulty is found in distinguishing between Regeneration and Renovation. The great internal change in the man, by which he is converted, and made a new creature, he calls Renovation, and wholly separates from Baptism. Regeneration, he says, takes place at Baptism, and *then only*. But then Regeneration means only a change of state and relation, *not* a change of character.

"The Holy Spirit," he says, "translates them out of a state of nature into a state of grace, favour, and acceptance." "The identity, if I may so express myself, of Baptism and Regeneration, is a doctrine which manifestly pervades the writings of the Fathers. It is moreover evident that they did not imagine that baptism produces any saving effect in adults without faith and repentance; or, in other words, without *some previous renewal* of the inward frame. Nor do they appear to have supposed that *any positive or active renewal of the soul takes place in infants*."[†]

Here, then, we have four or five different doctrines, as to "the effects of Baptism."

Dr. Pusey maintains, that a spiritual change takes place in the infant's soul, in the ordinance of Baptism.

Bishop Bethell holds, that no spiritual change takes place; but only a change of state and relation. This change of state and relation he calls Regeneration;—admitting that a further change, "a renewal of the *inward* frame," is necessary; which he calls Renovation or Conversion.

^{*} Dr. Pusey on Baptism, p. 127.

[†] Bishop Bethell on Regeneration, pp. 14–16.

A third class identify Regeneration strictly with the New Birth ; and aver that this great change is to be looked for *in Baptism* ; while they allow that it only takes place in those few instances in which faith in the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit is exercised.

A fourth consider Baptism to be merely an outward ceremony of admission into the Christian Church, "*representing* to us our profession," but not *being* what it represents.

Amidst all this, the press teems with books, sermons, treatises, pamphlets, all labouring to establish this or that view of "the Effect of Baptism." And in so far as Satan can fix men's attention on this distant and often inscrutable point, his main object is gained. The people, and not the people only, but even their teachers, are busy in discussing some supposed or alleged change which is said to have taken place years ago,—and are losing sight of *that* change which the great mass of them still require, to fit them for entrance into, and to make them capable of the enjoyment of, the happiness of heaven.

What we would earnestly press, therefore, upon our readers, is, the relinquishment, as far as possible, of this question as a matter of controversy ; and the sedulous direction of it into a practical channel. Disputes about the effect produced upon a child, years ago, when presented at the font, are endless ; and if they are to be decided by reference to books, they will probably be mischievous also. Give up Theories, and come at once to Facts. That child, you say, was regenerated eight years ago, at — Church. Let us see, then, what is his character now. Are the Scriptures his favourite study ? Is prayer a privilege and enjoyment to him ? Is the house of God his happiest spot ? If these things be so, then will we not dispute whether he were regenerated in Baptism or not ; for he has evidently been "born from above" either at that or at some other time.

But if the case be far otherwise : if the Bible be a mere task-book or story-book ; if his prayers be hurried over without feeling ; if the Church sees him idly gazing, or even slumbering,—what avails it to talk of the "effect of baptism" in his case ? Whether you choose to maintain that he was regenerated at his baptism, or not ; as to his present condition there can be no doubt. He loves sin. He does not love God. If he could be admitted into heaven, like Elijah, without death, and within the next hour, what would heaven be to him in his present mind, but another hell ? That "*renewing of his mind*" which is essential to fit a human soul for the enjoyment of heaven, has never taken place in him. If "regeneration" has really taken place in him ; then regeneration may take place without really benefiting the soul. Perhaps it

were safer to say, that inasmuch as he is "yet in his sins,"—it cannot be supposed that he was ever regenerated.

But it is not thus with all. Does not the name of Richmond remind us of another child, baptized, too, but not changed in baptism;—to whom, many years after her baptism, he was made the messenger of salvation? Shall we not recal her last moments?

"I said, 'My child, are you resigned to die?'

"'Quite.'

"'Where is your hope?'

"She lifted up her finger, pointed to heaven, and then directed the same downward to her own heart, saying successively as she did so, 'Christ *there*, and Christ *here*.'

"She turned to me with a look of surprising earnestness and animation, saying, 'You, sir, have been my best friend on earth—you have taught me the way to heaven, and I love and thank you for it—you have borne with my weakness and my ignorance—you have spoken to me of the love of Christ, and he has made me to feel it in my heart. I shall see him face to face—he will never leave me nor forsake me—he is the same, and changes not. Dear sir, God bless you!'

"The child suddenly rose up with an unexpected exertion, threw her livid wasted arms around me as I sat on the bedside, laid her head on my shoulder, and said distinctly, 'God bless and reward you—give thanks for me to Him—my soul is saved—Christ is everything to me. Sir, we shall meet in heaven, shall we not? O yes, yes—then all will be peace—peace—peace'—"

"She sunk back on the bed, and spoke no more—fetched a deep sigh—smiled, and died."

Here was the *Reality* of religion. Here was truth and Fact; a knowledge of sin; a knowledge of the Saviour;—not a discussion about the effect of a certain service read over an infant, some years before. And this is what we want. Let the Sacraments of the Church have due honour and esteem: but let not Names usurp the place of Things.

But we must not allow it to be said, or even imagined, that we would make nothing more than a decent rite or initiatory ceremony, of Christian Baptism. We doubt not that *some* of the children of Christian parents *are* actually regenerated, at the same moment, "of water and of the Spirit." That *all* are not so changed, we impute to the parents' want of faith; and would exhort, with Mr. Budd, to a firmer laying hold of the promises of the gospel. What we deprecate is, the substitution of a *supposed* regeneration, imagined to have taken place many years since, for that actual and real change of heart which has not taken place at all, and which is absolutely necessary for the sinner's safety.

"If we say that we have fellowship with God, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth." "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. He that hath the Son, hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life."

A VISIT TO THE INDIANS ON THE FRONTIERS OF CHILI. By Captain ALLEN F. GARDINER, R.N. London: Seeley & Burnside. 1841.

“WHAT is it which renders the little volume before us so interesting as it undoubtedly is?”—Such was the question which forced itself upon our minds as we closed the book, and it recurs to us with no less emphasis, now that we proceed to report upon what we have read. One thing is quite clear, that, whatever be the talisman by means of which the Gallant Captain enchants his readers, it is not the charm of style. Far from us be the wish to open a battery of pedantic criticism upon his unpretending craft. But, whilst we forbear, we claim credit for the forbearance. Sure we are that three guns out of four would have told with cruel effect upon such an extempore fabric. Just conceive how Etymology would have blazed away at an enemy who gives, without intermission, such provocations as these:—“Our mules *being swam* across,” p. 79, et passim; “Our journey *laying* through a flat and sandy district;” “proceeding *there—where* they desired to accompany me!” Then as for Syntax! what a raking fire would she have poured in upon one who, hoisting *English* colours, signalizes such challenges as these:—“A few miles exhausts the limits” of safety; “the person who he described;” “many parts of this route is strewed;” “the temperature of these springs are 88° or 90°;” “so imperious was the strata,” &c. &c.

Should it be pleaded these are mere slips, we are willing—quite willing—to believe it. We can cordially concur in the charitable conclusion—

“Non ego paucis
Offendar maculis;”

but still must add—

“Corrige, sodes,
Hoc et hoc.”

As the aspect of affairs is at present somewhat more pacific than it was in months that are past, we trust in a future edition to see the long-established concord between “Verbum Personale et Nominativus” established on a surer basis; and, for the sake of *humanity* (in its literary sense), we trust that the unhappy Relatives may be eased of some portion of the burden *which*, like the overladen mules of the Cordilleras, *which* separate the Chilian from the Buenos Ayrean provinces, *which* Captain Gardiner traversed, are sometimes plunged into an abyss from *which* they can seldom be extricated.

Another slight ground of complaint against the Author is, that he is too sparing of glosses and definitions. He forgets, in his characteristic simplicity, that there are some of his countrymen who have not, like himself, been in all five quarters of the world—(we conclude that the Captain is now in the fifth); and hence, on the principle, “*omne ignotum pro magnifico*,” we might suppose that a “poncho” meant a Cashmere shawl, or at least an hussar jacket; that a “gaucho” was an Inca, and an “arriero” his Gold Stick in waiting. So of “rauchos,” “arganas,” and “toggles.” What is “toggle?” Surely not one of those,

“*Quæ nunc sunt in honore vocabula.*”

Possibly, however,

“*Græco fonte cadit, parce detortum.*”

We ask only for information, and in behalf, as we trust, of a numerous circle of readers; for, after all, the book well deserves to be read. Its most glaring defects (would that we could say so in every case!) are those for which we have applied the ferule.

The question with which we started we may not be able to solve to the satisfaction of all; but we trust that, whilst all will regard the Author as a traveller “*sui generis*,” most will “esteem him very highly in love for his work’s sake.” Captain Gardiner avows himself a Christian missionary. His was not a visit to Chili, but to the Indians of Chili. “To communicate to them the saving truths of the Gospel has been the sole object of our visit to this country.”—(p. 88.) We frankly confess that a statement such as this operates so strongly upon our sympathies, that we can scarcely avoid having respect to persons, and pronouncing a partial judgment. When—we are led to ask, with all the eagerness of desire, if not of hope—when shall the time come in which *every* Christian traveller shall thus consecrate his enterprising talents to a truly Christian purpose? However interesting their narratives may be to readers of the ordinary stamp, is it not humiliating to read of British officers penetrating the wilds of interior Africa, and encountering the most trying perils and fatigues, merely to scour its colossal preserves, and revel in the exquisite sport of shooting buffaloes and elephants?

Very refreshing to our taste is the contrast presented by the little volume we have just laid down. Here is enterprise in abundance, and in its very essence; but none of that unceasing iteration of “swan-shot” and “rifles,” which constitute so much of the *materiel* of many a volume of Travels, Rescarches, Visits, &c.

Nor can it be proved, frequently as it may have been asserted, that none but a sportsman has an eye for nature. The Christian has the same organs and perceptions, and, for the most part at least, as keen a sense of the picturesque. At all events, his prospect is far more extensive, his horizon incomparably less circumscribed. There is *real* life in his landscape, and it exercises not merely his senses but his heart.

In confirmation of our position, and as illustrating the character of our Author, we quote the following sketch—its subject is the Lake of Rauco :—

“ But my attention was soon drawn to some of the peculiar features of the lake we were approaching, the bold mountains which environ its banks now occasionally appearing through the openings in the forest. Having understood at the house where we had passed the night, that Neggiman, the chief, was absent on a visit to Arique, we continued our route early on the following morning, still passing through a forest of high trees, until we reached another cluster of houses, among which was that of the chief. Some of these houses I entered, but hastened forward to the brow of a rising ground, in order to enjoy a full view of the lake, of which I had only hitherto caught detached glimpses. We were standing on its western border, an extensive sheet of water lay before us, probably about fifty miles in circumference. To the southward, in which direction its waters are conveyed by the Rio Bueno to the Pacific, the land is comparatively low and bare of trees, but to the northward it is hemmed in with bold ridges of wooded mountains, while the majestic Cordillera, clothed with snow, appeared to skirt its eastern limit. Eight islands of different sizes, some mere rocks, appeared in the centre; one of them, which gives name to the lake, is inhabited, and about two miles in length. With so many remarkable features, all blended and heightened by the interchange of wood and water, and the occasional flittings of clouds under a brilliant sky, it would be needless to say that it was beautiful; but there were other and not less interesting objects for contemplation. From the same spot the scattered houses of Vutronway (the name of this Indian village), with their several patches of cultivation, although half embossed in copses and indigenous apple-groves, were visible, the abodes of accountable human beings, but unto whom as yet the saving truths of the uncorrupted gospel had not been made known! All without, every object that met the eye seemed to ‘speak its great Creator’s praise;’ but he, for whose enjoyment all these beauties were arrayed, had not yet learned to raise one song of thanksgiving to Him who crowneth the year with his goodness. In the earnest hope that it might please the Lord to permit us to enter upon some work for his glory in this place, I first made application to the chief’s eldest son, and afterwards entered into a conditional agreement with a native, called Calfupang, who resided at the very foot of the knoll, which commanded the view I have described, to let his house to me, until a more suitable one could be erected.”—(pp. 130, 131.)

In this spirit the whole expedition seems to have been conducted. We remember being struck, when reading Captain Gardiner’s Zuloo narrative, with one admirable feature of Christian consistency—the unvarying and conscientious observance of the Sabbath-rest. The weekly bivouac, the Saturday “spanning out,” so entirely won our admiration, that we were more than reconciled to the well-meaning lyrics, in which feelings so devout were from

time to time expressed. It may at first sight appear strange, that we should dwell upon a point of such obvious obligation; and sincerely do we regret that the singularity of the example should occasion us thus to commend it to general notice. A little experience, however, has convinced us that Christian men, and in some cases Christian ministers, are too apt to allow themselves in a certain laxity as to this important duty, when they are in a foreign country, which would scarcely be tolerated, nay, and which they themselves would not tolerate, at home. The temptation is probably suggested on this wise:—"I am in a land where my principles are not known, and where consequently I can scarcely be said to set an example of inconsistency. My standard, the standard of my conscience, is not recognised here, and therefore my adherence to it would not be appreciated. A little unbending, in short, will neither compromise my profession before others, nor injure them."

Alas! how many an opportunity of bearing a testimony for God and his laws, silent indeed, but emphatic, is thus lost by British Christians, when sojourning amongst the *Christian* nations of Europe. On the other hand, we doubt whether any part of our Author's labours for the truth's sake, is likely to prove more beneficial than the impression which must have been made, in every varying scene and society, by his consistent example in this respect. It is eminently characteristic of his buoyancy of spirit and simplicity of faith, that nothing seems to have fretted or fatigued him, but the interruptions which he occasionally met with to the repose and devotions of the Sabbath—when staying for instance at some bustling posting-house.

Take the following as a specimen:—

"At Payne, our first halting-place, and where we remained for the Sunday, we were lodged at the Posada, dignified by the name of 'El Hospital,' but where we had not even a bedstead in a room, through the roof of which, in parts where the thatch was thin, we could observe the stars when the candle was extinguished. In these country inns, a ballad-singer is considered as indispensable, who is constantly employed during the day, in order to attract customers. She takes her post near the principal entry, accompanying her voice, generally loud and cracked, with her guitar. No exception is made, even on the Sabbath, and this desecration of the Lord's-day continued, with very little intermission, from soon after sunrise until sunset; but it was not the only annoyance; wine, which is here less than a rial (6d.) a bottle, soon began to circulate, and many who came only to listen could scarcely sit upon their horses when they returned. At Talca we were far better accommodated at the Cafe del Comerico; but in the inner court, exactly facing our windows, was a cock-pit, which was only opened on Sundays. From the first dawn of daylight we were disturbed by the shrill crowing of the numerous cocks which, in order to be in readiness, had been leg-tied in every corner of the two pateos. By eleven the place was crowded with spectators, and from that time until one or two o'clock in the afternoon the noise

and disturbance was so great, that we were literally obliged to take our books and adjourn to the hedges in the outskirts of the town for retirement. It is truly painful to reflect, that a government, calling itself Christian, should not only tolerate this barbarous pastime, but carry to its account, as a considerable item of its revenue, the sums which it annually acquires from the licenses granted to those who thus openly bid defiance to the better feelings of humanity and the express commands of God.'—(pp. 77, 78.)

We scarcely remember a single complaint which is not extorted by some *moral* grievance. Yet this is not to be attributed to the lack of personal annoyance or even perils. A very slight attention to the narrative will afford evidence, that the Gallant Captain had as fair a complement of both, as falls to the lot of most men, during ten short months of their pilgrimage. And here, if the *promiscuous* reader is struck with the Author's cool acquiescence in every discomfort incident to his migratory habits, how shall the *domestic* and reflecting reader sufficiently admire the patient heroism of Mrs. Gardiner, whose introduction to the nomade life is comparatively of such recent date, and who had throughout the expedition the charge of two infant children! Seldom have we felt a greater curiosity to be in a lady's confidence than in the present instance. "Tell us (we would ask), how do you really like all this pitching and striking of tents, this going up the Andes and down the Andes, this changing of continents every other year? Sympathizing no doubt in the excellence of the *object*, what is your private feeling as to the agreeableness of the *process*?" For our own part, we have never met with a more lively illustration of the practice which some of the primitive missionaries pursued, that of "leading about a wife;" and yet, to do the lady in question no more than justice, it should be added, that the only symptom of a remonstrance, was against the usual Cordillera fashion of being carried pickaback over the snow, by one of the Chilian mountaineers.

It is to be supposed, therefore, that Mrs. Gardiner joins in the verdict, that the five weeks' voyage from Table Bay to Rio de Janeiro was "a *pleasant* passage." Now then, let us proceed, for the instruction of some of our lackadaisical countrywomen, to analyse a few more of the *pleasures* of travel.

Here is the description of "a *pleasant*" *vehicle*—(that in which our party crossed the Pampas)!

"By half-past ten we were slowly winding our way in a galera through the broken and muddy streets which intersect the suburbs of Buenos Ayres. A galera is a heavy-looking vehicle, shorter, but in every other respect very much resembling an omnibus, swung upon strong twisted hide-springs, and carrying luggage on the roof, as also below, in a hide stretched and suspended between the hind wheels: it is entered behind, and has windows all round. Each of the five horses which drew us was mounted by a peon, or

postillion; but, excepting the two wheelers, which had each a pole-piece, none of the horses had any other connexion with the carriage they were drawing than a twisted hide-trace hooked to one side of the saddle-girth. Although defective, some advantages are obtained by this method, as each horse, irrespective of the rest, is enabled to diverge on a sudden to either side, and thereby avoid any obstacle or inequality in the road; they are also more easily attached, and at any time one or more can be disengaged, while the remainder are proceeding at their usual pace."—(pp. 25, 26.)

"With respect to the galera travelling, I would remark, that there were some periods throughout the journey, especially in the neighbourhood of Buenos Ayres, Luxan, and the rocky parts between Achinas and San Louis, when I should have given a decided preference to an African waggon, as far better adapted to the description of road, over which our spring vehicle was not merely rocked but agitated to excess. As these rough and ragged places are, however, an exception to the general plain and stoneless country, the galera is perhaps as convenient a description of carriage as could be devised. A little more length would be desirable, for the better accommodation of the party at night; and too much attention cannot be paid to the fixing and lining of the window frames, which we found, greatly to our inconvenience, admitted the rain when it continued for any length of time, so that on reaching Luxan it became actually necessary to drill large holes in the floor in order to drain it off. The method of attaching the horses is expeditious and convenient, but I think imperfect. One trace is fixed by a loop and toggle to the saddle of each horse, under the pillion. By this he draws, or rather by the saddle; but as the saddle only retains its proper position as long as the girth remains tight, and there is, in consequence of this method, an undue strain upon it, it is not surprising that it should often become slack, and require to be tightened. Indeed this was one principal, almost our only, detention by the way. Every now and then it became necessary for one or other of the peons to dismount for the purpose of replacing the saddle, which had been drawn back, and tightening the girth. It appeared to me that the mere addition of a chest-band would have obviated all this, and moreover enabled the horses to have drawn more evenly, the draught at present being chiefly on one side. A drag, which is never carried, would have been useful on two or three occasions, especially when crossing the Arroyo de Arcefe, and descending the steep bank of the river Desaguadero; but both men and horses are so accustomed to supply the deficiency, by casting their weight as a counterpoise at the end of a long lasso, that the descent, however rapid, is performed with equal facility, and perhaps with less risk. In the latter instance, as the water was above the floor of the galera, it was lightened of such of its contents as were likely to be immersed, and these, with ourselves, were conveyed across on a rude raft, floated by six empty casks lashed beneath, called a *balsa*."—(pp. 35—37.)

Admire next the "*pleasant*" *road*!

"The soil in this province is a stiff clay, without stones, and as much rain had fallen previous to our setting out, the roads, if they deserve the name, for some distance beyond the city, were almost impassable for spring-carriages. Far from going off at a gallop, our progress at the commencement was exceedingly slow, the ruts often engulfing the wheels to the naves, and rendering it very doubtful whether we should not be deposited by the way in some of the numerous quagmires through which we were dragged."—(p. 27.)

Envy next the "*pleasant*" *accommodation*, and "*pleasant*" *company*, and "*pleasant*" *length of way*!

"Nothing could be more wretched than the generality of the post-houses on the ~~road~~ *road*; some indeed were substantially built, but the greater part were

miserable hovels without windows, and in one or two instances without doors. The roofs, until reaching San Luis, were usually plaistered with a mixture of mud and straw, which, when properly prepared, is said to be sufficiently water-proof. The floors are of mud, with a raised platform of the same material on one side, to serve the purpose of a bedstead. One or two stump bedsteads, with hides laced to the frame instead of sacking, were occasionally to be met with, and these, with a rude table, two or three straight-backed crazy chairs, and a bowl of water, were the sum total of the furniture. Even this, to us who had so lately been accustomed to South African travelling, would have been comfort, had we not been obliged to pay too dearly for the indulgence. We had been previously warned of the numerous inhabitants of these solitary abodes, and had resolved to have as little communication with them as possible, but, although we commenced by sleeping in the galera, it was impossible to "taboo" our garments during our occasional visits for breakfast, supper, &c. The consequence was, that our favoured retreat, the galera itself, soon became so thickly colonized, that from sunset to sunrise it was scarcely tenable, so that for the advantage of space, which was now more than ever desirable, we gave the preference to the post-house, and occupied it for the night, endeavouring to sleep, which was, after a vain attempt for some hours, effected. In long stages we found the advantage of sleeping in the galera, as the peones, always desirous to start soon after daylight, were thus enabled to put to at their own time, so that we were often some distance on our way, at a round gallop, before the children were up; and at the next post-house the operations of the toilet, &c., were performed while the breakfast was preparing. In the same hasty manner (for on many accounts no time should be lost in crossing the Pampas) was our dinner dispatched, seated in the galera, while the horses were changing, a fowl stewed overnight having been taken on the roof in the saucepan; so that in fact we were travelling, without intermission, for nine or ten hours on an average every day. Deducting the Sundays, and two half days on which we did not travel, we were but fourteen days from Buenos Ayres to Mendoza, a distance of 948 miles."—(pp. 29, 30.)

Once more observe the "pleasant" *liabilities*!

"There is scarcely any part of the road that is not liable to occasional attacks from the wandering Indians; but on reaching those districts which are considered as the most exposed, we observed that many of the post-houses were entrenched within a deep ditch, and further defended by an interior hedge of cactus. These vegetable ramparts, which grow to a great height, and being evergreen, cannot be fired, are admirably adapted for the purpose, and are said to be impervious to any attack from the Indians, who never dismount on these occasions, and whose only weapons are a long lance and a couple of stone or metal balls, sewn into the ends of a short lasso, which they swing round and round as they advance, and wield with great dexterity.

"The post-house of Baton, which is surrounded by a double cactus hedge of great height, with a ditch between, is the best specimen of this description of stockade on the road; but I was greatly surprised to observe the entire want of a similar precaution, in parts of the country which from time time have been wasted and pillaged by the Indians, and where many individuals have been murdered by them."—(pp. 31, 32.)

Enough has now been laid before the reader to shew, that if our Author has not made much of his materials, it is not because those materials are deficient in interest or variety. We unhesitatingly attribute a large measure of the enjoyment which the narrative has afforded, to the scope which it has given for the play of the

imagination. We have from the beginning realized it as a domestic progress, and busied ourselves with picturing the domestic routine. What an invaluable tenement must that accommodating "galera" have been! The "stall," storied in immortal verse, was nothing to this. Day and night nursery—school-room—dressing-room—shower-bath—floating-bath—"parlour, kitchen and all."

Then again, who would not be a "pickaninny," to be rocked in such a cradle as the following?

"Immediately after the baggage followed the children in their panniers, one on each side of a mule, led by a mounted peon riding before. These panniers, of the above dimensions, were made of raw hides laced to a flexible framework of wood, and were not only safe and convenient, but with the aid of cloaks and cushions were made so easy, that the children, when tired of sitting up, often slept as comfortably in them as in their beds."—(pp. 52, 53.)

And which of our tarry-at-home mothers will not enter into the "life and character" of the following sketch:—

"Mrs. Gardiner and myself, mounted either on horses or mules, brought up the rear of this singular cavalcade, in order that we might observe the whole, and be ready to assist the children in case of difficulty; as it sometimes happened, during these long and tedious journeys, that the leader of their mule would fall fast asleep while unconsciously proceeding at his usual pace. But although our progress was necessarily slow, there was always a degree of *life and character* about it, which no mere description, however graphic, can justly convey."—(p. 53.)

On the whole, we never met with a writer who was apparently so fresh in the art of book-making. Conceive the astonishment of some of our friends in "The Row," at the simplicity of a man who could spend four days at St. Helena, and not devote a single chapter to Napoleon's tomb—the weeping-willow, and so forth! In fact, a knowing hand would have eked a volume out of this single sentence.

"After a pleasant passage" (i.e. from Table Bay), "having remained four days at St. Helena, and passed within a few miles of the north end of the bold and rugged island of Trinidad, we anchored in Rio Janeiro harbour on the 21st of June."—(p. 6.)

In all this, however, we discern the sterling excellence of our Author's character. His mind was filled with one grand object. To that he subordinates every incident and every description, taking for granted that his reader cordially sympathizes with his views.

It may be proper, therefore, before we dismiss this very agreeable little volume, to state distinctly and seriously our views as to its practical value in reference to missionary efforts. We acquiesce entirely in the Author's own account of the expedition which it details. It may very fairly be designated as "a journey of inspection." The

information thus communicated is far from being destitute of encouragement. But we are bound to add, that the only very promising opening for the exertions of Christian philanthropy, which we can call to mind, is that for the circulation of the Scriptures, on the Mendoza side of the Cordillera.

The express object of Captain Gardiner's enterprise was—to carry the gospel to the *Indians* of Chili. And how did it speed? In repeated instances, his overtures were listened to with seeming acquiescence for a time, till the customary present had been handled, and were then as invariably declined.

Neggiman, for instance, one of the independent chiefs, after having granted permission to the zealous traveller to settle at Vutronway, suddenly alters his decision, and the matter is thus summarily concluded.

“He then again reverted to his determination not to permit Spaniards (Chilenos are thus designated by them) to reside among his people, adding that I was moreover a foreigner, ‘from another country,’ and that he must therefore withhold his consent.”—(p. 136.)

“Dejected but not in despair,” our pious and persevering Author undertook another journey, in the direction of Osorno. In this quarter, however, Popish influence was predominant.

“The Indians were described as Christians, and regarded themselves as belonging to one or other of the several adjacent chapelries.”

The tourist next sets out for Queule, and on his arrival, has an interview with Wykepang, the chief. It is thus described:—

“A native from one of the nearest houses conducted us to that of his chief, more in the centre of the valley, who was not within, but soon afterwards made his appearance, having just been bathing in the river. Two low wooden stools, over which some skin horse-rugs were spread, were brought out by the women, and on one of these the chief, Wykepang, seated himself, after the accustomed ‘murry, murry’ had been duly interchanged. He was an elderly man, rather short of stature, of a stout muscular frame, with coarse features, and somewhat blunt in his address. His first enquiries were, as to whence I came, and where I was going? and he quite laughed at my design of passing forwards to visit some other chiefs beyond. No ‘Spaniards,’ he said, were living in these parts; they were not permitted to remain. In the absence of my guide, who was pursuing one of the horses which had strayed, I endeavoured, by the help of a native, who understood Spanish, to obtain his sentiments regarding the particular object which I had in view, inquiring whether he had ever heard of God's book. He expressed his surprise that I should possess it, but seemed quite indifferent as to its contents. Being asked if he would permit a missionary, who would instruct him and his people in that book, to remain with him? he quickly replied, that he did not want one, enquiring at the same time if I were a missionary. I told him that I greatly desired to teach them God's word, but that it would be necessary first to learn their language, and proposed that he should allow me to visit him again, and to remain with him a sufficient time to acquire it. To this proposition he seemed quite averse, and on the return of my guide began to speak very loudly, asking from what country I came, whether it was not in

the neighbourhood of Buenos Ayres, &c. He then informed me that I must return, that he would permit me to remain for the night, but that it would not be safe to stay longer, as the other chiefs would be angry with him, and make war upon him if he allowed me to go farther."—(pp. 146—148.)

The sturdy chief, after having been stroked down a little on the following morning, by the irresistible fascination of "a few yards of red ferrit," is coaxed into the following quasi-concession :

"I inquired as to what reception he would give me, supposing on my next visit it should be found that I had acquired his language? 'Then,' he said, 'you may come without fear;' and although he would not guarantee an equally favourable treatment from the chiefs who resided more in the interior, yet from his manner, and the probability which he expressed of their relaxing from their usual restraints upon strangers under such circumstances, I not only felt that I had gained his mind on this subject, but that it was, humanly speaking, the hinge and turning-point of the whole matter in question."—(p. 150.)

We repeat, however, the by no means unimportant fact, that it was not until the munificent visitor had

"Soothed with a gift and greeted with a smile,"

that the courteous and compliant host even so far relaxed.

Here then, is the whole amount of evidence before us! The gallant author's own conclusion was, that he could not hope to comply with the chieftain's *sine quâ non* under some eight or ten years, two languages having to be acquired in the interim; and if we are not much mistaken, our missionary societies will practically arrive at the same result. They will say—"We thank Captain Gardiner for his information; it may be available in days to come! We trust that even now, it will quicken our prayers for the interesting race in whose behalf he pleads. But whilst, in so many places, the fields are actually white unto the harvest—whilst millions of our Indian fellow-subjects are urging the importunate cry, Come over and help us—when a great and effectual door is actually *opened* to our operations—and whilst, notwithstanding, the labourers are few, and our resources so crippled—can we hesitate as to where lies the priority of claim? May we not "*assuredly* gather" where *first* it is "that the Lord hath called us for to preach the gospel?"

In parting with our interesting author, we beg to assure him of our Christian regard and esteem, and shall be truly happy once more to exchange a cordial "murry murry" with him, should he favour us with an account of his journeyings and labours in New South Wales.

ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY AND THE DOCTRINES OF
THE OXFORD TRACTS. By the Author of "Spiritual
Despotism. London: 1840.

It is not our intention, in the present article, to review the whole series of these tracts (of which six numbers have already appeared), or to present our readers even with a summary of their general argument. As the work is yet incomplete, a better opportunity than the present may perhaps be afforded us of attempting one or both of these objects. We are now principally concerned to furnish such a corrective, as in our judgment is required, to one particular position, which the learned and truly candid writer has laid down. The position affects materially that important section of the Church, which for the sake of distinction he has denominated *Evangelical*. While, however, a sense of public duty compels us to offer the following strictures, we readily acknowledge the courtesy and kind feeling exhibited in the Author's remarks; and we should regret exceedingly, if in attempting to take off their edge, or to avert their stroke, we should give utterance to a single word at variance with the spirit of which he has given so honourable an example.

In the outset of his argument he endeavours to point out the various disqualifications under which different parties lie, in opposing the writers of the Oxford Tract. The classes enumerated by him are—the *High Churchman*, the *Political Churchman*, the *Evangelical Churchman*, and the *Dissenter*. We meddle only with his representation of the Evangelical Churchman; and that we may not be chargeable with giving a distorted view of the case, we shall allow him to speak for himself:—

"We must look to another quarter in quest of those who might come forward, unencumbered, to withstand the advances of the Oxford doctrines; and may it be to that, in every sense, estimable portion of the clergy,—call them not a party—which has conventionally been designated, Evangelical? It is true that the modern disciples and successors of Romaine, Fletcher, Milner, Cecil, Scott, and Newton, have, by the sheer force of the current of Church affairs, been carried towards a new position, and have been led greatly to modify and to tighten the ecclesiastical notions professed by their departed leaders. They nevertheless still hold to opinions, and to modes of feeling, which though, as a matter of fact, springing up within the Established Church, are not of it, are not its genuine products, or strictly indigenous to its soil; for they were the products of the new religious animation, diffused through the country by the apostolic labours of Wesley, Whitfield, and their followers; nor can it well be denied that those who have professed these opinions, and who have felt in this manner, have stood, as churchmen, in what is called—a false position; at least a position of difficulty, and of some practical embarrassment."—(p. 8.)

With regard to these "departed leaders" of the evangelical section of the Church, whose names our Author mentions, we shall not stop to take exception against any, though they were by no means all equally attached to what are called "Church principles." We do not suppose that the writer means to pledge that portion of the Church which he designates as evangelical to the opinions of all and each of these leaders severally; but that he only speaks in general terms, in order to give a broad, rather than an accurate, statement of the case.

There are, then, two assertions in the quotation we have made, which demand consideration. The first is, that both the authors of the evangelical movement in the Church, and their successors, have held, and do still hold, to opinions which, though springing up within the Church, are not of it, but are the effect of the labours of Wesley, Whitfield, and their followers. The next is, that the latter have been compelled, by circumstances, to assume a higher tone of churchmanship than their predecessors.

We mean not to depreciate the indefatigable labours of devoted men, such as Wesley and his associates, nor to deny that, in many respects, they have produced a salutary influence upon the Established Church. But this is not the present question. The real point for consideration is, Did the religious movement of the last century begin *in* the Church, or *out* of it? Our Author maintains the latter part of the alternative—we contend for the former.

It is matter of history, that vital religion, both in and beyond the pale of the Establishment, was at the lowest ebb about the commencement of the seventeenth century. At this time certain movements, indicative of some degree of life, though faint and languishing, were made in and about the metropolis, as well as some other parts of the country; and societies were formed, chiefly under the direction of Dr. Horneck and others, for the purpose of promoting personal piety. With what party did these societies begin? Not with Dissenters, but with the members of the Establishment. It is true, they soon declined, owing perhaps to the defective views of evangelical truth, which at that time pervaded all classes of the community. They wanted Luther's doctrine of justification by faith to consolidate their union and to extend their influence. Yet the fact itself to which we refer affords a presumption in favour of our general argument, by showing that our episcopal Established Church was a soil more favourable to inward piety than any form of dissent at that time existing.

Let us next advance to the subsequent and far more decisive movement originating with the Wesleys at Oxford. Was not the very first impulse, on this occasion, given *in the Church*, and

through the medium of the strictest Church principles? Without adverting to the course which the Wesleys ultimately took, and which has nothing to do with our present question, we must admit that no principles adverse to Church principles gave the first religious impulse to their minds. It was through the reading of books by Church writers—it was through a diligent attendance on all Church services, such as daily prayers and weekly or monthly sacraments—that they first attracted attention as religious characters. Indeed they subsequently incurred obloquy rather by carrying certain Church principles—as they are called—too far, than by failing in the application of them. A conference held in 1738, between the two Wesleys and the learned Dr. Gibson, Bishop of London, showed that in some of the most important points maintained by the Oxford Tract writers, these founders of Methodism were higher churchmen than his Lordship, for they contended vehemently against him as to the validity of Dissenters' baptisms.

Enough has been said to show that there is no ground for the assumption which was so boldly made at first, that it is now received almost as an axiom by writers of the highest class, that the Established Church is not in principle favourable to the culture of evangelical piety. This is a prejudice which has proved most injurious to the Church, and which it is high time to dislodge from the public mind. As an instance of the existence of this prejudice, and of the candour with which it was both avowed and surrendered, we may refer to the Journal of Mr. Williams, an eminent dissenter of Kidderminster, who, after having stated that for many years he had been praying for the revival of God's work, adds that he had at length seen it burst forth, where he had *least expected* it, among the young students in the University of Oxford.

We are aware it will be argued, that if the Establishment could not prevent the first dawnings of this great work from issuing out of her own University, yet she used all her power to extinguish the spark, by driving her own children into separation and dissent. And this is deemed sufficient evidence that Church principles are essentially uncongenial to the growth of evangelical piety. But to arrive at a sound conclusion in this case, a distinction must be made between men and principles. Let us, for the sake of argument, and nothing more, grant that the Church authorities who opposed the Wesleys were, in all their measures, culpable, and that these good men and their followers acted with uniform wisdom and piety. Yet it may easily be shown, that the principles on which the dominant party acted were not properly CHURCH principles. The men who might with ease have guided this current of religious

feeling strove to stem it, and thus caused it to overflow all the banks of order and discipline. But in doing this, they themselves departed, perhaps, quite as widely from Church principles as the persons whom by their continued opposition they drove gradually further and further from the Church.

In order to elucidate this, however, as well as other parts of our argument, it will be necessary to define what we are to understand by the term Church principles. The most essential and important principles of the Church of Christ are the great doctrines of the Trinity in Unity, the fall of man, original sin, salvation by faith in Christ, and holiness of heart and life, as necessarily springing from it. Whatever pertains to ritual, to government, or to discipline, can only belong to the rank of subordinate principles. Because the *doctrines* of the Church are of fundamental consequence, the rest are accessories, and derive their whole value from their suitability as means to uphold or promote her leading and essential doctrines. Yet it almost universally happens, that where Church principles are spoken of, these great first principles of sound doctrine are overlooked, and the attention is turned to the mere adjuncts, which, however useful or necessary in their place, form but the minor portion of Church principles. Of this oversight we think our author has been guilty, and that he has thus fallen into a common mistake, when reasoning upon the position which the clergy whom he designates Evangelical hold in the Church. Again: by Church principles we do not mean the principles of the Nicene Church, nor yet of the Oxford Tract divines, but of our reformed Anglican Church, as settled by our Cranmers, Latimers, Ridleys, and Jewells, and as expounded in our Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies.

Now if there be some persons who arrogate to themselves the title of Churchmen, on the sole ground that they put a more literal interpretation on some passages (for instance in the baptismal service) than the evangelical clergy do, this surely is a very insufficient basis for such self-preference, when at the same time they directly contravene, or insidiously explain away, the doctrine of the Church on original sin, on the depravity of man, and on justification by faith, which are interwoven with our public services, are explicitly declared in our Articles, and boldly enforced and unfolded in the plain and energetic language of our homilies. Should it be granted that the evangelical clergy, wishing to take a comprehensive view of the whole doctrine of the Church, find it necessary, in weighing its different statements, to qualify the terms used in one part, in order to prove the general agreement and consistency of the whole, what do they more than all are

obliged to do with apparent discrepancies of Holy Writ, such as—to mention but one instance—that which presents itself in the declarations of St. Paul and St. James in the doctrine of justification?

The difference between the high churchman and the evangelical churchman (adopting our Author's classification) seems to be this: the former lays the chief stress upon the ritual, the latter upon the doctrine; and we have no hesitation in pronouncing the latter the sounder churchman of the two. Hence we cannot conceive him to lie under any such embarrassment, in dealing with the question in hand, as the Author of *Ancient Christianity* supposes.

On the other point assumed by our Author, namely, that the "modern disciples and successors" of Romaine and others have been carried towards a new position, and have been led greatly to modify and to tighten the ecclesiastical notions professed by their "departed leaders," it will be necessary to offer one or two remarks.

We must not decide on the degree of attachment really felt by the leaders in question, to principles of strict churchmanship, without taking into account the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed, and the work which they had to accomplish. Esteeming, as they did, the great doctrines of Scripture and of the Church, respecting the fall of man, his recovery by Christ, the necessity of the Holy Spirit's influence to convert and save the soul of man, with that which is the keystone of the work, justification by faith alone without the deeds of the law—esteeming, we say, these great doctrines as of paramount importance and indispensable necessity, and finding that while the minor parts of Church doctrine were adhered to with a rigid severity, these were forgotten, or only remembered in order to be misrepresented and censured—can we be surprised that, when they saw the citadel of the Church in danger, they should pay more attention to *that* than to the outworks? Yet we believe it would be easy to prove, from the remains of these departed worthies which are handed down to us, that when the doctrines of evangelical truth began to re-assume their just ascendancy within the Church, they gradually, independently of any impulse from without, relinquished those courses which were or seemed to be opposed to Church order, and into which they had either fallen through inadvertence, or been driven by what they deemed the urgent necessity of the case. By the very same process have the evangelical clergy of the present day been induced—if induced at all—to advance upon the position of their predecessors. Just as the doctrines of the gospel become prevalent within the Church, the necessity for methods bordering

on irregularity diminishes, and parochial order and ecclesiastical discipline become more compatible with the general propagation of divine truth. In all this we see no inconsistency—nothing which might not reasonably have been anticipated by an acute observer, who was also able to take a comprehensive view of all sides of a question.

With these views we must seriously object to the following observations:—

“ They ”—the evangelical clergy—“ may, by the aid of peculiar considerations, drawn from the perils of the times, have brought themselves to believe that they seriously disaffect nothing in the ritual or constitution of the Church; and they may be satisfied with this or that elaborate explanation of certain difficulties; nevertheless, the uneasiness, although assuaged, is not removed, for the difficulty is real, and its reality and its magnitude must be brought afresh before them, to the renewal of many painful conflicts of mind, whenever the genuine and original Church of England principle and discipline comes, as now, by the Oxford divines, to be insisted upon, expounded, and carried out to its fair consequences.”

The supposition that the evangelical clergy have been induced, by a consideration of the perils of the times, to persuade themselves that they approve what they really dislike, is not very creditable either to their principles or their understanding. The explanation of difficulties may sometimes be elaborate and yet sound; the mind may have found some difficulty in reaching them, and yet may be perfectly satisfied with them when once they have been obtained. It was not to be expected that, in a complicated system of Church government, formed out of many different elements, there should arise no difficulty whatever. But we contend that, after all, the difficulties with which the Oxford Tract Writers have to contend, in reconciling their system with the collective documents of the Church, are far greater than those which meet the sound and sober evangelical Churchman.

This brings us to that which we consider the great mistake of our Author—a mistake from which has sprung that inconclusiveness of reasoning, which to our judgment is exhibited in this portion of his work. These are his words:—

“ What the English Reformers had in view was—ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY, or the doctrine, and discipline, and ritual of the Nicene age, and of the times nearly preceding that age; and so far as the altered condition of the social system, and so far as the secular despotism allowed them to follow their convictions, they realized their idea, and probably would have done so to the extent of a close imitation, had it been possible, of all but the more offensive features of that early system.”

We join issue with the Writer on the first sentence in this extract. It was *not* the design of the English Reformers to re-establish the Nicene system of doctrine, ritual, and discipline.

They looked much higher; and whatever predilections they might show for the early Fathers of the Church, their real intention was to promote the pure doctrine of the Scriptures, by such means as appeared to them best adapted to the purpose. With this for their great end, we may admit that they retained as much as they could of the ancient ritual of the Church, and willingly adopted from antiquity whatever seemed suitable to her leading purpose. It must be allowed that it was a work of great difficulty and delicacy, to steer their course between the extremes into which either of the conflicting parties of that day—the juxta-Papists or ultra-Protestants—were disposed to rush. Nay, perhaps there was still greater difficulty in maintaining the true independence of the ecclesiastical system under the reigns of the Tudors and the Stuarts; yet their object was pursued with a general steadiness—notwithstanding occasional waverings—and with a success—notwithstanding partial failures—which prove them to have been far removed from a childish adhesion to the Nicene Church, or from servile submission to imperious rulers.

But it is perfectly superfluous to go one step beyond the work now under review, to disprove the statement we are now controverting. What, according to our Author, were the principal features of the Nicene Church?

The first doctrine adduced by our Author, as distinguishing the Nicene Church, is that of *celibacy*, with all its accompaniments of monastic extravagance and folly. This was a subject which, he declares, “has intimate alliance with the entire ecclesiastical and religious system of antiquity.” “It touches the view taken by the church of Christianity, as a moral economy, or ethical system, from the very earliest times; it touches too the principles whence sprung the most ancient notions concerning the mysterious properties of the sacraments; it touches intimately the powers of the clergy; it touches the fundamental doctrines of justification and sanctification; in a word, it leaves nothing in the theological or ecclesiastical system of ancient Christianity untouched.” Is it necessary to ask, whether our English Reformers adopted or sanctioned this important and essential principle of Nicene Christianity? If, rather, on the contrary, they opposed it in every way, and with all their power, with how little truth can it be affirmed that they either wished for or attempted “a close imitation” of the Nicene Church! This part of the agreement is strengthened by a reference to the fact, that Henry the Eighth was a strenuous advocate for the celibacy of the clergy, and that Cranmer endured his Royal Master’s displeasure for refusing to give his sanction to this ordinance of the early church.

Now on this vital point it is needless to add, that the evangelical clergy are with the Reformers, and against the Nicene Church and the Oxford Tract Writers. It cannot be here, therefore, that they would be under any embarrassment in contending with the latter.

Another prominent characteristic of the early church, on which our Author enlarges, is its **DEMONOLATRY**, including prayers for the dead, the worship of relics, pictures, and images, with all the superstitious usages springing from a fountain so corrupt. Did the Anglican Church at the Reformation sanction or resist this widely-spreading abuse of the Nicene age? Here again we may inquire, "Are not the Evangelical churchmen of the present day arrayed with the leaders of their church, and on a fair vantage-ground, against Froude and his successors of the Oxford school?"

We have passed through the two distinguishing traits of the Nicene Church, to the exposure of which the Author of "Ancient Christianity" has devoted his chief strength. There are, however, two more, "the prominence of the **SACRAMENTAL** and **RITUAL ADJUNCTS** of the gospel, and **HIERARCHICAL DESPOTISM**. The former of these he has already considered, though but incidentally; the other remains for future discussion. In these, therefore, if anywhere, we must look for resemblance between our Reformers and the fathers of the fourth century. Yet even here points of contrast are more numerous than points of agreement. With regard to *sacramental virtue and efficacy*, we know that there was a slow and gradual change in progress in the mind of Cranmer and others, which at length brought them so near to the continental divines, that Knox, the great forerunner of the Oxford Tract Writers, regarded the doctrine as placed in the greatest jeopardy; and the language in which many of the Tractarians speak on the subject, leaves no room to doubt that they regarded Cranmer, Jewell, and others of the greatest Reformers, as little better than traitors to the church. Here again we are confident that the evangelical clergy are much nearer the Reformers than either the Oxford school or their favourite fathers are, and therefore we cannot see any peculiar disadvantages to which they would be exposed in taking their part in the present controversy. Nor, lastly, does the topic of *hierarchical despotism* seem to furnish any sufficient ground for our Author's judgment of the Reformers, or for his opinion concerning the disqualification of the party to whom he alluded, for engaging in this contest. The Reformers are too vehemently charged by the Oxford divines with following an *Erastian* policy, which handed over all church authority to the secular power, to leave any room for the charge that they attempted the imitation of the spiritual despotism of the Nicene age. But our Author dis-

poses of the argument when he speaks of a certain hypothesis as involving "the establishment of the strictest spiritual despotism, and as being essentially opposed to the principles of the Lutheran and English Reformation."

If from these main topics we descend to particulars of doctrine, we shall see still more clearly how wide apart are our Reformers and the Nicene Church; and how strikingly, in each case, the evangelical clergy coincide with the Reformers, and the Oxford Tract writers with their predecessors of the fourth and fifth centuries. Our Reformers insist upon the supreme authority of Holy Scripture, and so do the evangelical clergy. The Nicene Fathers paid great, and perhaps equal, respect to the traditions of the church; and so do the Oxford divines. The Fathers of the Anglican Church spoke on the doctrines of the gospel without reserve, and are in this followed by the clergy of the evangelical school. The Nicene Fathers dealt in mysteries, which they would unfold only to the initiated, and their track is pursued by their modern Oxonian disciples. But it is not needful to protract our remarks. We have said enough to prove that the Reformers did not attempt what the disciples of the Oxford School are now attempting, to establish "the doctrine, discipline, and ritual of the Nicene age;" and that therefore the disability of the clergy styled evangelical, to cope with the modern champions of the Nicene system, is imaginary and not real.

We do not, however, mean to deny that there are *quæstiones vexatæ* arising out of certain principles of Church government; such as the power belonging to the clergy, the episcopal succession, the efficacy of the sacraments, and so forth, which appear not to have been clearly defined and fully settled by our Reformers, and respecting which much may be said, on opposite sides, by those who enter into the controversy. But of this we are quite sure, that all the leading assumptions, made on the part of the ultra-churchmen of the present day, may, one by one, be confuted by an appeal to the writings or the practice of the best divines of the Reformation.

We have, in the foregoing observations, reasoned on the supposition, that our Author's views of what is styled the *Ancient Church* are correct. In the main we believe them to be so; but we think he would have rendered his general argument less assailable, had he discriminated with greater precision between those Fathers who immediately succeeded the apostolic age, and the more learned but less simple-minded writers of the Nicene period.

SLAVERY AND THE INTERNAL SLAVE-TRADE IN THE
UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA; *being Replies*
to Questions transmitted thither by the Anti-Slavery Society.
London: *Ward.* 1841.

WE confess that we have no patience with that mock sensibility which cannot abide a tale of crime and suffering, but neither troubles its possessor with an uncomfortable feeling about the reality, nor rouses him to a single effort to put an end to it. In the very midst of the fiendish atrocities of the French Revolution, and while their streets literally ran with blood, the savages of Paris would scream and sicken at the theatric representation of the poison-bowl or the assassin's dagger. From no circumstance in the history of those fearful days do we, with such utter loathing, turn away.

Our readers will expect no apology from us in introducing to their notice a picture of human nature, such as it may be seen, (we rejoice to believe,) in but one country upon earth.

The United States of America contain *two million seven hundred and seventy thousand slaves*. Of their condition, and treatment by their masters, the people of Great Britain, until within the last few years, knew comparatively nothing. The abolition of slavery in the West India islands, as well as the inquiries and discussions which preceded and led to that great act of national justice, in a measure removed this ignorance. Both parties—pro-slavery and anti-slavery—were accustomed to appeal to America in support, each of its particular view, and thus some light came to be thrown upon the subject. This was from time to time increased by the contributions of successive travellers, (Mr. Stuart, Captain Basil Hall, Miss Martineau, &c.) until at last we began to think that we had grown tolerably familiar with the chief features of “American slavery.” How strangely, by the way, the phrase sounds, when one is so constantly stunned by hoarse vociferations of “American liberty.”

Satisfied, however, as were many, and we confess ourselves to have been of the number, with the information thus obtained; believing that it furnished the groundwork whereon to build a sufficient judgment, there was, it would appear, one body in the community which entertained a different opinion. That body—the Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society—determined to transmit a number of queries to the friends of abolition, a small but increasing band, in America. These queries were intended to

embrace every point of interest connected with the subject, and the answers were expected with an anxiety commensurate with its importance. They have reached the shores of England. In the book, the title of which has already been placed before the reader, at the head of this article, they are to be found.

We consider the work thus produced of such fearful interest and importance, that we shall probably transfer many passages from it to our pages in the course of this article. If after reading them, more especially if after a careful examination of the whole mass of evidence, our readers find not reason to bless God that their lot has been cast in a country where slavery is unknown, and from whose colonies it has at length disappeared, we shall be content to be branded as "lying prophets" for the rest of our lives.

We have already warned the man of sensibility what he may expect. If his heart fail him, let him accompany us no farther. We have a terrible tale to tell. But if there be within him the spirit of "a man and a brother"—if it be the great desire of his soul, next to the service of his God, "to do good unto all men"—and if, in carrying out that desire, he feels, as he necessarily must feel, that "knowledge is power," then in the name of sacred charity, in the name of suffering humanity, in the name of every victim of oppression "fast bound in misery and iron"—let him on with us.

The States of the American Union may be divided, with reference to the matter in hand, into three classes. *First*, those in which slavery has been abolished by their respective legislatures; *secondly*, slave-holding states, in which the greater proportion of the negroes are reared for sale in other parts of the Union; these are coarsely, but not inappropriately, termed "breeding states:" and, *thirdly*, slave-holding states, the planters residing in which purchase the negroes from the breeding states, and employ them chiefly in the cultivation of the soil.* These last are called "consuming states;" and as in them the features of slavery are most strikingly developed, we intend to make them the principal subject of our remarks. For the same reason we select for comment the case of the prædial, rather than that of the domestic slaves.

The great object of the American planter is to tax to the utmost the physical powers of his slaves, in order to produce the largest possible return from their labour. It is found, at least it is believed, to be more profitable to wear them out quickly, and then to supply their place with new purchases, than, by sparing them, to occasion a proportionate diminution in the sugar or

* Nine out of every ten slaves in the planting states are prædials—the rest are domestics.

cotton crops. In like manner it is to the pecuniary interest of the master to stint them to the smallest allowance that can satisfy the imperative wants of nature.

If, in addition to these considerations, account be taken of the bad passions of the human heart, set free from all external restraint, and bursting forth at times with furious violence against those who dare not for their lives resist, the following statement will not take the reader by surprise, whatever be its effect upon his nerves :—

“ The slaves suffer from being overworked, from hunger, from want of sleep, from insufficient clothing, from inadequate shelter, from neglect in the various conditions of feebleness and sickness, from lust, and from positive inflictions.”—(p. 77.)

Here is a catalogue of miseries inflicted by man on his unoffending brother ! But to the proof.

In supplying it we must content ourselves with adducing *less than a twentieth part* of the testimony ready to our hand. We attempt no arrangement, no digest of the horrid mass. As we find it, so we cast it before the reader, a hideous compound of wickedness and woe.

“ Sugar-planters upon the sugar-coast in Louisiana have ascertained, that as it is usually necessary to employ about *twice* the amount of labour during the boiling season, that was required during the season of raising (cultivation), they could, by excessive driving night and day during the boiling season, accomplish the whole labour *with one set of hands*. By pursuing this plan they can afford to *sacrifice a set of hands once in seven years !*”—(Statement made by Mr. Dickinson, of Pittsburgh, to Mr. Demming, and substantially admitted by a number of slave-dealers present at the time.)

“ Planters generally declared that they were *obliged* so to overwork the slaves during the sugar-making season, (from eight to ten weeks,) as to *use them up in seven or eight years*. ‘ For,’ said they, ‘ after the process has commenced, it must be pushed without cessation night and day.’

“ It is not only true of the sugar planters, but of the slaveholders generally throughout the far south and south-west, that they believe it for their interest to wear out the slaves, by excessive toil, *in eight or ten years after they put them into the field*.”—(Statement of Mr. Samuel Blackwell, a highly-respected citizen of Jersey city.)

“ The law of South Carolina permits the master to compel his slaves to work *fifteen hours* in the twenty-four in summer, and *fourteen* in the winter ; that is, in winter from day-break until *four hours* after sunset.

“ The law of Louisiana provides for the slaves but ‘ *TWO AND A HALF HOURS*’ in the twenty-four for ‘ rest.’

“ The other slave states have *no laws* respecting the labour of slaves ; consequently, if the master should work his slaves day and night without sleep, till they drop dead, *he violates no law*.”—(p. 87.)

There was, it seems, in the last war between Great Britain and the United States, one General Hampton, of South Carolina, in command of the American troops upon the Canadian frontier.

This wretch died some years ago, being at the time the largest slaveholder in the Union. Had the British forces but known the character of their enemies' leader, it had more surely "nerved" their "arm and steeled" their "heart" than did the taunt of Roderick Dhu the arm and heart of Fitz-James. Listen and judge:—

"A lady in the west, of high respectability and great moral worth, once sat in company with General Wade Hampton and several others, when the General undertook to entertain the company with the relation of an experiment he had made in the feeding of his slaves *on cotton seed*. He said that he first mingled one-fourth cotton-seed with three-fourths corn, on which they seemed to thrive tolerably well; that he then measured out to them equal quantities of each, which did not seem to produce any important change; afterwards he increased the quantity of *cotton-seed to three-fourths*, mingled with *one-fourth corn*, and then he declared, with an oath, that '*they died like rotten sheep!*' "

The witness to this fact, "a distinguished clergyman in the west, extensively known both as a preacher and writer," adds, in confirmation of the appalling story,

"From Dr. Witherspoon, whose former residence was in South Carolina, I received a particular account of the manner of feeding and treating the slaves on the plantations of General Wade Hampton, and others in the same part of the state; and certainly no one could listen to the recital without concluding that such masters and overseers as he described must have hearts like the nether millstone. The 'cotton-seed experiment' I had heard of before, as having been made in other parts of the south; consequently I was prepared to receive as true the above statement, even if I had not been so well acquainted with the high character of my informant."—(p. 90.)

To continue:—

"On almost every plantation the hands suffer more or less from hunger, at some seasons of almost every year. There is always a good deal of suffering from hunger. On many plantations, particularly in Louisiana, the slaves are in a condition of *almost utter famishment* during a great portion of the year."—(Statement of Mr. Asa Stone, a theological student, who resided near Natchez in 1834-5.)

"It is shocking to the feelings of humanity, in travelling through some of those states, to see those poor objects (slaves), especially in the inclement season, in *rags*, and *trembling with cold*."—(Statement of John Parish, of Philadelphia, a minister in the Society of Friends.)

"Amongst all the negro cabins which I saw in Virginia, *I cannot call to mind one* in which there was any other floor than the *earth*; anything that a northern labourer or mechanic, white or coloured, would call a *bed*; nor a solitary *partition* to separate the sexes."—(Statement of Mr. George A. Avery, elder of the fourth Presbyterian Church, Rochester, New York, who lived four years in Virginia.)

"When the Ladies' Benevolent Society in Charleston, South Carolina, of which I was a visiting commissioner, first went into operation, we were applied to for the relief of several sick and aged coloured people. On inquiry, we found that *nearly all* the coloured persons who had solicited aid were *slaves*, who, being no longer able to work for their "owners," were

thus inhumanly cast out in their sickness and old age, and must have perished but for the kindness of their friends."—(Testimony furnished by Sarah M. Grimké, a sister of the late Hon. Thomas S. Grimké, of Charleston, South Carolina.)

The following quotation is from a sermon publicly delivered in Norwich (America), by the Rev. J. T. Dickinson, July 4, 1834. We have a copy of this sermon now lying on the table before us.

"The slave laws are such as almost entirely to destroy the institution of marriage, and to produce general licentiousness. I quote in proof the testimony of the Rev. Mr. Paxton, a friend of the Colonization Society, and formerly a slaveholder. 'The law does not recognise marriage among slaves, so as to clothe it with the rights and immunities which it has among citizens. The owners of either party might the next day or hour break up the connection in any way they pleased. In fact, these connections have no protection, and are so often broken up by sales, and transfers, and removals, that they are by the slaves often called 'taking up together.'"

The following is part of a communication made by Mr. H. B. Staunton, of Lane Seminary, Ohio, to the editor of the New York Evangelist. A copy of this communication is in our possession.

"Large numbers of female mulattoes are annually bought up, and carried down to our southern cities, and sold at enormous prices to a life of shame and dishonour. This is a fact of universal notoriety in the south-eastern states. It is known to every slave-driver in the nation. In the consummation of this measureless abomination threats and the lash come in, where kind promises and money fail."

Some one, we do not at this moment remember who, has observed, that the character of a people may be known from the advertisements in their newspapers. Are the American slaveholders willing to abide the test?

ADVERTISEMENTS TAKEN FROM AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS.

"Ten dollars reward for my woman Siby, very much scarred about the neck and ears by whipping. (Signed) 'ROBERT NICOLL.'"
(From the "Mobile Commercial Advertiser.")

"Committed, a mulatto fellow—his back shows lasting impressions of the whip, and leaves no doubt of his being A SLAVE. (Signed) 'JOHN A. ROWLAND.'"
(From the "Fayetteville Observer," June 20, 1838.)

"Ran away, negro fellow John—from being whipped has scars on his back, arms, and thighs. (Signed) Messrs. C. C. WHITEHEAD & R. A. EVANS."
(From the "Standard of Union," June 26, 1838.)

INCONSISTENCY OF SLAVEHOLDERS CALLED CHRISTIANS. 213

"Ran away, a negro named David—with some *iron hobbles around each ankle*.
(Signed) "HAZLET LOPLANO."
(From the "Spectator," Sept. 27, 1838.)

"Ran away, negress Caroline—had on a *collar with one prong turned down*.
(Signed) "T. EUGGY."
(From the "Bee," October 27, 1837.)

"Was committed to jail, a negro boy—had on a *large neck iron with a huge pair of horns, and a large bar or band of iron* on his left leg.
(Signed) "H. GRIDLY."
(From the "Memphis Times," Sept. 1834.)

"Ran away, the negro Hown—has a ring of iron on his left foot. Also, Grisee, his wife, having a *ring and chain on the left leg*.
(Signed) "CHARLES CURENER."
(From the "Bee," July 2, 1838.)

"Committed to jail, a man who calls his name John—he has a *clog of iron on his right foot, which will weigh four or five pounds*.
(Signed) "B. W. HODGES."
(From the "Montgomery Advertiser," Sept. 29, 1837.)

"Ran away, a negro woman and two children. A few days before she went off I *BURNT HER WITH A HOT IRON* on the left side of her face: I TRIED TO MAKE THE LETTER M.
(Signed) "MICAHAH RICKS."
(From the "Raleigh Standard," July 18, 1838.)

"Ran away, a negro named Arthur—has a considerable *scar* across his *breast and each arm*, made by a knife; *LOVES TO TALK MUCH OF THE GOODNESS OF GOD*.
(Signed) "J. BISHOP."
(From the "Camden Journal," March 4, 1837.)

We dare not designate as he deserves the wretch who could use a taunt like this. We may but say, "The Lord rebuke thee."

"Was committed to jail, a negro man—says his name is Josiah; his back very much scarred by the whip, and *branded on the thigh and hips in three or four places*, thus (J. M.): *the rim of his right ear has been bit or cut off*.
(Signed) "J. L. JOLLEY."
(From the "Clinton Gazette," July 23, 1836.)

"Stolen, a negro man named Winter—has a *notch* cut out of the left ear, and the mark of *four or five buck-shot* on his legs.
(Signed) "JAMES MARKS."
(From the "Natchitoches Herald," July 21, 1838.)

This "notching" is like the "branding," to indicate ownership. The shooting with "buck-shot" is a pleasant amusement, of which the reader will find an instance described in the next page.

"Ran away, a negro man and his wife, named Nat and Priscilla—he has a small *scar* on his left cheek, *two stiff fingers* on his right hand with a *running sore* on them; his wife has a *scar* on her left arm, and one *upper tooth out*.
(Signed) "SAMUEL RAWLINS."
(From the "Columbus Sentinel," Nov. 29, 1838.)

So much for *the advertisers*, now for *the editors*.

"On Saturday night, Mr. George Holmes, of this county, and some of

* "Another method of marking slaves is by drawing out or breaking off one or two front teeth."—(p. 117.)

his friends, pursued a runaway slave (the property of Mr. Holmes), and fell in with him. Mr. H. discharged a gun at his legs, for the purpose of disabling him; but *unfortunately* the slave stumbled, and the shot struck him near the small of the back, of which wound he died in a short time. The slave continued to run some distance after he was shot, until overtaken by one of the party. *We are satisfied, from all that we can learn, that Mr. H. had no intention of inflicting a mortal wound.*

(From the "Raleigh (North Carolina) Register," Aug. 20, 1838.)

"Two or three days since a gentleman of this parish, in *hunting runaway negroes*, came upon a camp of them in the swamp on Cat Island. He succeeded in arresting two of them, but the third made fight, and upon *being shot in the shoulder* fled to a sluice, where the *dogs succeeded* in drowning him before assistance could arrive."

(From the "St. Francisville (Louisiana) Chronicle," Feb. 1, 1839.)

We beseech our readers to mark the style in which American newspaper editors announce these fell deeds to their countrymen. *This* is the point to which we would direct attention, far more than to the particular atrocity described. There is no wickedness so great but that *individuals* may be found, in most places, capable of committing it. But a *community* whose public press dares thus to speak of murder the most unprovoked—murder the most deliberate—murder the most cold-blooded—that community cannot surely be far removed from the last and lowest condition of fallen humanity, when the moral sense has become utterly depraved, and conscience, "seared as with a hot iron," no longer recognises the distinction between right and wrong.

We proceed:—

"Some persons suppose that all *strong* feeling on the part of abolitionists is *wrong* feeling; but they forget that we have heard, from the best authority, such facts as these:—'A gentleman of his acquaintance,' said Mr. Ladd, 'was offended with a female slave. He seized her, thrust her hand into the fire, and there held it *until it was burnt off*. I saw,' said Mr. Ladd, 'the withered stump.'—Mr. Sutcliff, a Quaker, who travelled in this country, relates this case:—'A slave-owner lost a piece of leather. He charged a little slave boy with stealing it. The boy denied. The master tied the boy's feet, and suspended him from the limb of a tree, attaching a heavy weight to his ankles, *as is usual in such cases*, to prevent such kicking and writhing as would break the blows. He then whipped. The boy confessed, and then he commenced whipping anew for the offence itself. *At length the boy died under the lash*. Then the slave-holder's own son, smitten with remorse, acknowledged that *he* took the leather.'"—(Extracted from Mr. Dickinson's Sermon already referred to at page 212.)

"On the 28th of April, 1836, in the city of St. Louis, Missouri, a black man named M'Intosh, who had stabbed an officer that had arrested him, was

seized by the multitude, fastened to a tree *in the midst of the city*, wood piled around him, and in open day, and in the presence of an immense throng of citizens, he was burned to death. The 'Albion (Illinois) Telegraph,' in its account of the scene, says:—"After the flames had surrounded their prey, his eyes burnt out of his head, and his mouth seemingly parched to a cinder, some one in the crowd, more compassionate than the rest, proposed to put an end to his misery by shooting him, when it was replied, 'That would be of no use, since he was already out of pain.' 'No, no,' said the wretch, 'I am not, I am suffering as much as ever; shoot me, shoot me.' 'No, no,' said one of the fiends who was standing about the sacrifice they were roasting, 'he shall not be shot; *I would sooner slacken the fire, if that would increase his misery*;' and the man who said this was, as we understood, an OFFICER OF JUSTICE!"

"Lest this demonstration of 'public opinion' should be regarded as a sudden impulse merely, not an index of the settled tone of feeling in that community, it is important to add, that the Hon. Luke E. Lawless, Judge of the Circuit Court of Missouri, at a session of that court in the city of St. Louis, some months after the burning of this man, decided officially, that since the burning of M'Intosh was the act, either directly or by countenance of a *majority* of the citizens, it is 'a case which transcends the jurisdiction of the grand jury!'"—(p. 126.)

When we had advanced thus far through the terrible book before us, we imagined that the worst must at length be past. We were mistaken—one step yet remained—then indeed the climax of horror was complete. We had seen the negroes subjected to toil that crushed them into their graves in "eight" short years—we had seen them tormented with "whips," and "chains," and "iron hobbles," and "iron collars," and "clogs of iron," and "branding irons," and "huge horns," and "notched ears," and "broken teeth," to say nothing of "hunger," "cold," and "nakedness." We had seen them poisoned with "cotton seed," "struck down with buck-shot," "flogged to death," "drowned by dogs," and "roasted alive." We had yet to see this infernal system upheld by the example of members of Christian (so called) churches. We had to see wretches, blasphemously assuming the title of "ministers of the gospel,"—dispensing at one moment the ordinances of religion—at the next wielding the knotted scourge—aiming the murderous rifle—or cheering on the blood-hound to his human prey!

Amongst the questions to be found in the volume before us is the following:—

"How far are the professors of religion tacitly, or actively, implicated in the guilt of slave-holding, or any of its attendant evils?"—(p. 131.)

We quote some portions of the answer to this inquiry.

"Slave-holding professors of religion exact as much labour, employ as barbarous overseers, stint the food, clothing, and sleep of their slaves, and furnish them as wretched shelter and lodgings, as other masters. They flog as severely and as frequently, lacerate, bruise, maim, crop, brand, gash, kick, chain, and imprison, with the same relentless barbarity. They allow licenti-

ousness to as great an extent, and they equally neglect the religious instruction of their slaves."—(p. 133.)

"A Presbyterian minister in Georgia had a negro man. For some cause, I know not what, this minister *whipped him most unmercifully*. He next *nearly drowned him*. He then *put him in the fence*. This is done by lifting up the corner of a worm fence, and then putting the feet through; the rails serve as stocks. The poor slave *died in a few days*. I have heard this minister preach, and have been in the pulpit with him. May God forgive me."—(Testimony of the Rev. Francis Hawley, agent of the Baptist Convention of North Carolina.)

At a previous page we find the witness thus acknowledging his own guilt, and expressing his sincere repentance. This cannot but dispose the reader to place confidence in his testimony.

"Runaway slaves are frequently hunted with guns and dogs. I was once out on such an excursion, with my rifle and two dogs. I trust the Lord has forgiven me this heinous wickedness."—(Rev. Francis Hawley.)

Again:—

"A Baptist clergyman in Laurens district, South Carolina, *whipped his slave to death* whom he suspected of having stolen about sixty dollars. The coroner, William Irby, at whose house I was then boarding, told me that he found the body *beat to a jelly from head to foot*. The master's wife discovered the money a day or two after the death of the slave. She had herself removed it from where it was placed, not knowing what it was, as it was tied up in a thick envelope. I was present at the trial of this man at Laurens Court-house. His daughter testified that her father untied the slave, when he appeared to be failing, and gave him cold water to drink, of which he took freely. His counsel pleaded that death might have been caused by drinking cold water when in a state of excitement. The jury found him **NOT GUILTY!**"—(Testimony of Mr. Ezekiel Birdseye, of Cornwall, Connecticut.)

"Mrs. Pence, of Rockingham county, Virginia, used to boast, 'I am the best hand to whip a wench in the whole county.' She pinioned the girls to a post in the yard on the Lord's-day morning, and scourged them. I once expostulated with her on her cruelty. 'Mrs. Pence, how can you whip your girls so publicly, and disturb your neighbours so, on the Lord's-day morning?' Her answer was memorable: 'If I were to whip them on any other day I should lose a day's work; but, *by whipping them on Sunday their backs get well enough by Monday morning*.' That woman was a member of the church."—(Testimony of the Rev. George Browne, of New York, who was a preacher for seven years in Virginia.)

In the "Southern Christian Herald" (1835) were reported certain resolutions proposed at a public meeting in Lancashire, South Carolina, by the Rev. J. H. Thornwell, and the Rev. Mr. Carlisle. We quote in the first place two of these resolutions, and then, by way of comment on them, the conclusion of a letter addressed by the Rev. R. N. Anderson, a Presbyterian minister, "to the sessions of the Presbyterian congregations within the bounds of West Hanover Presbytery."

"Resolved,

"1. That slavery, as it exists in the south, is no evil, and is consistent with the principles of revealed religion; that all opposition to it arises from a misguided and *fiendish fanaticism*, which we are bound to resist in the very threshold.

"2. That all interference with this subject by fanatics is a violation of our civil and social rights—is unchristian and inhuman, leading necessarily to anarchy and bloodshed; and that the instigators are *murderers* and *assassins*."

"If there be any stray-goat of a minister among us tainted with the *blood-hound principles of abolitionism*, let him be ferretted out, silenced, excommunicated, and left to the public to dispose of him in other respects.

"Your affectionate brother in the Lord,

"ROBERT N. ANDERSON."

The part of our subject which now engages the reader's attention will be appropriately closed with an extract from "an address read by the Rev. J. C. Postell, member of the South Carolina Methodist Conference, to the Citizens of Orangeburgh, July 21st, 1836."

"SLAVERY IS NOT A MORAL EVIL. The fact that slavery is a DIVINE APPOINTMENT would be proof enough with the Christian, that it cannot be a moral evil. So far from being a moral evil, it is a MERCIFUL VISITATION—'IT IS THE LORD'S DOING, AND MARVELLOUS IN OUR EYES.' And had it not been for the best, God alone who is able, long since would have overruled it. IT IS BY DIVINE APPOINTMENT."—(p. 152.)

Neither blasphemy nor madness can go farther than this.

Slavery, as the reader is already aware, has been abolished *by law* in the northern states. Let him not, however, conclude that some of its most odious features may not there be seen. The fact is, there exists everywhere throughout the Union a *slavery of caste*, disgraceful in the last degree to the whites, and intolerably oppressive to the people of colour. The slightest taint of African blood debars from all intercourse with white society, and in many instances from the common decencies of civilized life.

"This ferocious prejudice is even more inveterate in the free than in the slave states." (p. 219.)

"It controls the pulpit and the press—presides in the hall of justice—gives law to the jury-box—stands door-keeper at the places of public amusement—partitions off the house of God—and makes the communion-cup a respecter of persons."—(p. 222.)

We must make room for one or two illustrations of this "ferocious prejudice."

"I am acquainted with a gentleman of Brazil, shrewd, enterprising, and respectable in character and manners. He has experienced almost every species of indignity on account of his colour. Not long since he was visiting the southern shores of Massachusetts. His wife was in a feeble state of health, and the physicians had recommended a voyage. He took passage for her, with himself, in the steam-boat. After remaining on deck some time, Mrs. — attempted to pass into the cabin, but the captain prevented her, saying, 'You must go down forward.' The Brazilian urged that he had paid the customary price, and that therefore his wife and infant had a right to a place in the ladies' cabin. The captain answered, 'Your wife a'nt a lady; she is a nigger.' The ladies' cabin was occupied only by two sailors' wives. The affair was concluded by placing the coloured gentleman and his invalid wife on shore, and leaving them to provide for themselves as they could."—(From Mrs. Child's "Appeal.")

“ Standing advertisement of the Zoological Institute of New York :—

“ The proprietors wish it to be understood, that people of colour are not permitted to enter, except when in attendance upon children and families.”—(p. 224.)

“ Mr. James E——, a respectable coloured man, residing in Massachusetts, purchased a pew in the church which he attended. As soon as this became known, private meetings were held, which resulted in summoning Mr. E., to give an account of his proceedings. He was accused of a wilful and flagrant outrage upon the church and upon the society. When requested to declare the price he had paid for the pew, he declined answering. A committee was appointed, and the meeting adjourned.

“ This committee called on Mr. E. to ‘ labour with him,’ as they termed it. The elder attempted to justify their proceedings by talking of a gradation in creation, from the highest seraph to the meanest insect. To support this doctrine, he quoted from the fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians: ‘ All flesh is not the same flesh ; but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.’

“ On the third Sunday a cord was observed suspended from the gallery ; on examination, it was found that a jug of filthy water was tied to it, and so arranged as to empty itself upon whoever touched the line on entering the pew. The remainder of the seats and walls were soon after torn down, and thrown into an adjoining pasture. A temporary seat answered the purposes of the family for a while ; but in a short time this was demolished, and the platform itself torn up, leaving a hole about two feet square.”—(pp. 223, 224.)

Let it be borne in mind, that both New York and Massachusetts are “ *free*” (!) states.

That no doubt may be entertained of the authenticity of the foregoing details, we would remind the reader, that they rest upon the exclusive authority of Americans themselves ; nay, in a great measure upon that of the very perpetrators of the deeds. We may well say, in the language of the Apostle Paul : “ These things were not done in a corner.” They are, in truth, the acts, not so much of individuals as of the body to which they belong*—not perpetrated under cover of night and darkness, but in the open eye of day—not deplored and reprobated as plague-spots upon the national character, but defended, boasted of, gloried in. In short, one might as well doubt that these Americans are noisy advocates of human rights, as doubt that they thus trample all right and all decency under foot. The proof of the one is not a whit stronger than that of the other.

We must not omit to mention, that upon the following points, all intimately connected with the question before us, our limits have compelled us to remain silent. With regard to these, therefore, we can but recommend our readers to examine for themselves.

1st. The countenance and support which *the Federal Government* affords to slavery, by refusing to abolish it in the district of Columbia, and by the admission of new states, as *slave-holding states*, into the Union.

* Of the horrible newspaper advertisements, of which the reader has seen specimens, the book before us contains *one hundred and ninety-six*. Deeds, dates, names, places, one and all, are published to the world as mere matters of course.

2nd. The internal slave-trade, by which *eighty thousand* slaves are annually torn from their families and homes, and transported to hopeless bondage in distant parts of the Union.

3rd. The foreign slave-trade, by which *thirteen thousand* natives of Africa are annually smuggled into the southern slave-states.

4th. The prohibition, *by law*, of the education of the slaves, extending even to the teaching them to read the Scriptures.

5th. The disgraceful efforts made throughout all the states to get rid of the free coloured population, by promoting and encouraging their deportation to Africa.

And, lastly, the demoniacal fury with which not the principles only, but the persons, of abolitionists are assailed and threatened, so that for such openly to visit the southern states would be to expose themselves to imminent risk of assassination.

We have heard much during the last three or four years of citizens of the United States associating themselves together under the name of "sympathizers"—their design being, they tell us, to assist "the oppressed Canadians in shaking off the British yoke." It would appear, however, that the "oppressed" Canadians have not, on their part, shown much sympathy with the schemes and principles of "the sympathizers." They seem to think, that "British bondage" is, after all, a somewhat more valuable possession than "American liberty." We opine that Americans themselves have sufficiently proved, even by such comparatively scanty testimony as we have been able to transfer to our pages, that in this the people of Canada are chargeable with no error in judgment. We will further venture to hope, that the reader who has accompanied us thus far, whatever may have been his opinion when first he took up the pages in his hand, is now a staunch believer in the same doctrine.

. Since the foregoing pages were written, the political horizon has grown dark with the signs of a threatening storm. It is our anxious hope—it is our earnest prayer—that both our own country and guilty America may be preserved from the horrors of war. But should the contest be forced upon us, by the madness of our rival beyond the Atlantic, (and nothing short of this could justify us in engaging in it,) we can imagine no nobler undertaking, nor one better calculated to subserve the designs of Government, than the attempt to liberate the miserable American negroes.

In the British West Indies slavery exists no longer. Danger in that quarter has passed away. More than this—*there* are three hundred thousand grateful freedmen—"sympathizing" freedmen—who would bring stout hearts and willing hands to aid us in the holy work. "Sat verbum sapienti."

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN WORSHIP; *or, the Evidence of Holy Scripture and the Church concerning the Invocation of Saints and Angels, and the Blessed Virgin Mary.* By J. ENDELL TYLER, B.D., Rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. London: *Rivingtons.* 1841.

THE name of the respected author of this volume is itself a guarantee for words of truth and soberness. We confess, however, that when we started upon our critical tour of exploration, the first step was not altogether free from the "*paræ recinentis omen*," for we could hardly reconcile the terms of the dedication with the "name, style, and title" of the rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. "To the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, as a tribute of veneration and love, this work is dedicated, by her devoted servant and son." We thought involuntarily of the "*Saviour's Holy Home*," and almost dreaded, for an instant, to find Mr. Tyler among the cavalcade of those who have lately set out on a pilgrimage thither from the bosom of his mother university. Our uneasiness, however, was soon dissipated by a more favourable augury, for we discovered, from the preface, that nothing was further from the intention of Mr. Tyler than to overlook or to understate the points of difference between the Churches of England and Rome, however he may deprecate the "*bitter words of controversy*," the imputation of heresy on the one side, or idolatry on the other. "*Truth*," he justly observes, "*must never be sacrificed to secure peace; nor must we be tempted by the seductiveness of a liberality, falsely so called, to soften down and make light of those differences which keep the Churches of England and Rome asunder. But surely,*" he continues, "*the points at issue may be examined without exasperation and rancour; and the results of inquiries carried on with a singleness of mind, in search only for the truth, may be offered on the one side without insult or offence, and should be received and examined without contempt and scorn upon the other.*" This amply sufficed to unravel the mystery of the dedication, and permitted us to entrust ourselves, as we are wont, with all but implicit confidence, to the guidance of the rector of St. Giles. And we have found his pledge, as we expected it would be, so amply redeemed, that if Romanists of the lower class were trusted by their priests to read, and Romanists of the higher class would trust themselves to reason, few, we think, could arrive at the conclusion of the work without the conviction, that though "*there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, as*

there be gods many and lords many, yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom were all things and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him."

The range of inquiry, originally contemplated by Mr. Tyler, presented a far wider field than could be embraced in a single volume. It was his first intention to furnish an historical survey of the doctrine and practice of the invocation of Saints, and Angels, and the Virgin, tracing it from the earliest intimation of anything of the kind, through its various progressive stages, till it had reached its widest prevalence in Christendom. He has, however, (and we cordially rejoice in the arrangement,) limited his researches on the nature of "primitive Christian worship" to the writers of the Church Catholic who lived before the Nicene Council, or were members of it. In this he has done wisely. An age of ecclesiastical corruption can only be prolific of errors and of heresies, ingenious in fabricating and inventing fresh varieties of falsehood, without any new developments of truth: and if the principle which our Lord applied to individuals, "If any man do his will, he shall know the doctrine," be applicable to communities also, it follows, that in whatever period there was the greatest laxity of practice, there would be the least purity of doctrine—the least spirituality of worship. The testimony of writers after the Nicene Council, therefore, whether to the establishment of any doctrine, or to the recommendation of any mode of worship, must be utterly worthless. In one respect only has Mr. Tyler deviated from this judicious regulation, namely, with regard to the "Assumption of the Virgin Mary," on which much of the religious worship now paid to her seems to be founded. He has done this, however, for the best possible reason—a reason simply to state which is equivalent to a formal refutation of the doctrine, that he can "find no allusion to this doctrine in any work written before the middle of the fifth century." What further proof can be required, that "in vain they do worship, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men?"

Mr. Tyler enters on his task, which he pursues in the form of an address, by referring to the prejudice at which we have already glanced, which either indisposes the Romanist to read, or disqualifies him from reasoning on what he *does* read. By those who attach implicit credence to whatever the Roman Church pronounces to be truth, the book, as the author himself anticipates, will of course be thrown aside as preposterous. He has been assured, however, that with many of her communion the case is far otherwise. We hope his information is correct. We apprehend, nevertheless, that this treatise will be found far more effectual

in fortifying, by sound argument, the minds of those who are in danger of being misled by the subtleties of Popish superstition, than in making converts from among those who are already entangled in its toils. We wish from our heart it could be placed in the hands of every one among the company of youthful academics, who are moving so precipitately in the direction of Rome, as to be far in advance of the leaders themselves. No person capable of reasoning, we think, could peruse Mr. Tyler's remarks on private judgment, without being prepossessed in favour of an argument to be conducted on such principles. He regards the Holy Scripture as "paramount and supreme," appealing to the witness and mind of the Church as "secondary and subsidiary; a witness not at all competing with Scripture; never to be balanced against it; in ascertaining whose testimony we examine the sentiments and practice of the ancient teachers of the Church—not as infallible guides, nor as uniformly holding all of them the same opinion, but only as helps in our examination of the evidence of the Church. When we have satisfied ourselves that a doctrine is founded on Scripture, we receive it with implicit faith, and maintain it as a sacred deposit, admitted to our keeping, to be delivered down whole and entire, without our adding thereto what to us may seem needful, or taking away what to us may seem superfluous."

A principle, so exactly harmonizing with the formularies of the Anglican Church that it might be expressed in their very terms, must of necessity commend to every reader of that Church the inquiry which it professes to regulate. It has, too, the further advantage of bringing the whole subject within the range of comparatively uneducated men, who are yet gifted with powers which they may apply to the discovery of the truth; and who, by the superior proportion of time and mental effort, which they devote to the perusal and examination of the Holy Scriptures, may "learn even more than the ancients, because the testimonies of God are their meditation." It is perfectly manifest, that if one effect of the word of God be "to make wise the simple," wisdom is communicated to them, not by human instrumentality alone, but by a divine intervention. He, with whom the wisdom of the world is foolishness, causes the foolishness of the world, under His teaching, to become wisdom; and to this end He directs the right use of judgment, imperceptibly, by the very persons whom man would despise, as only qualified to walk through life in obscurity, and grope their way to heaven in the darkness. Mr. Tyler shews clearly his respect for private judgment, by the frequency of his appeal to its unbiassed and appropriate exercise

Confident in the goodness of his cause, he asks nothing of the reader more than that he will give the Author the compliment of his attention, and himself the trouble to reflect. With this view, the subject is divided into three parts.

I. What inference, as to the invocation of Saints and Angels, would an unprejudiced study of God's will incline us to adopt?

II. What was the belief and practice of the primitive Church? And,

III. To compare the results of these inquiries with the tenets and practice of the Church of Rome.

After this, Mr. Tyler proposes to examine, separately and distinctly, the worship of the Virgin Mary, disguised by Romanist writers under the sonorous and specious name of "Hyperdulia." Having made the arrangement, he proceeds with the emphatic prayer, "May God guide us to his truth!"

It would obviously lead us far beyond our limits, did we attempt to follow Mr. Tyler through every stage of this important and interesting inquiry. We must be permitted, therefore, to state his conclusions, rather than the process by which he arrives at them; and for the intermediate chain of reasoning we must refer to the volume itself, which, we are sure, will neither discredit the recommendation of the critic, nor detract from the high reputation of the writer, as one eminently combining zeal for the truth with sound judgment and discretion. Mr. Tyler's "wisdom dwells with prudence." For ourselves, we shall think that our time has not been unprofitably employed, if we can fix the attention of our readers on a work so worthy to receive, and so able to repay it.

First, we have the direct evidence of the Old Testament to the fact, that God alone is the proper object of worship, and that there is no trace of anything that bears the slightest resemblance to an appeal to any subordinate mediators or intercessors whatsoever. In the Roman ritual, supplication is made to Abel and to Abraham, as well as to Michael and all Angels. "Holy Abel, pray for us: Holy Abraham, pray for us: Holy Gabriel, pray for us." Now, it is quite clear that there is nothing whatever in the Scriptures of the Old Testament to justify such an innovation, or to form, even in the remotest degree, a precedent for it; and accordingly Bellarmine, unable to deny this, professes to account for it by the fact, that none of those holy men of old were admitted into heaven, and endowed therefore with power to intercede, before the resurrection of Christ. Yet, forgetting that he has used this argument, he urges elsewhere a passage of Leviticus, to prove that the saints are admitted at once into the enjoyment of the presence of God in heaven, without waiting for the day of judgment. God,

he says, commanded it to be written, "The wages of the hireling shall not remain with thee until the morning; therefore unless God would appear inconsistent with himself, he will not keep back the reward of his saints till the end of the world." "How strange," adds Mr. Tyler, "that in the same treatise this author should expressly maintain, that the reward of Abel and Abraham, and the holy prophet and lawgiver Moses, the very man who was commanded to write that law in Leviticus, was kept back; the last for a longer period than a thousand years; the first well nigh four thousand years." We agree with Mr. Tyler in all but the *strangeness* of this self-contradicting, self-refuting logic." "When the blind lead the blind," we cannot be much surprised if "both fall into the ditch."

Having proved that there is not even the vestige of justification in the Old Testament for the practice of invoking departed saints, Mr. Tyler next examines those passages by which the Romanist writers have endeavoured to maintain that religious adoration was paid to angels. Of this, the principal instances which they attempt to press into their service are the case of Abraham bowing down before three men, whom he recognises as messengers from heaven (Gen. xviii. 2); and, secondly, the words of Jacob, when he gives his benediction to his grandsons (Gen. xlviii. 16). Mr. Tyler first shows, that the phrase, "bowed himself to the ground," which the Vulgate strangely renders "adoravit," was not necessarily an act of *religious* worship, as the Hebrew word is the same, letter for letter, in Genesis xxxiii. 3. *There* we read, that Jacob *bowed himself to the ground* seven times, until he came near to his brother Esau, whom he did not, assuredly, design to worship as a Deity; and, secondly, that many of the early Christian writers, of whom Mr. Tyler names Justin Martyr and Athanasius, maintain, fully and elaborately, that the "angel to whom Abraham bowed himself" was no created being, but the Angel of the covenant of God, who in the fulness of time was manifested in the flesh." By the latter solution, the subtle controversialist is at once deprived of his accustomed refuge, i.e. quibbling about the precise meaning of a word. The other example is shown to be equally inapplicable, inasmuch as the context sufficiently indicates that the object of the Patriarch's address was not Michael, or Gabriel, or any archangel, or seraph, or created being: for "the Angel who redeemed him from all evil," and whom he implores to "bless the lads," is the same whose appearance is recorded in a former chapter (Gen. xxxi. 11). "And the Angel of God spake unto me in a dream, saying, Jacob. And I said, Here am I. And he said, I am the God of Bethel, where thou anointedst the pillar,

and vowedst a vow unto me." The object, then, of Jacob's worship was the God of Bethel, and no created being; and it is indeed a "lame and impotent conclusion" from these two examples, to offer to the archangel Michael such an invocation as the following:—

"O holy Michael, O Archangel, defend us in battle, that we perish not in the dreadful judgment!"

We should neither do justice to Mr. Tyler, nor to our own feelings, did we omit the expression of compassionate earnestness—more forcible even than the vehemence of honest indignation—with which Mr. Tyler addresses himself to Romanists who believe and practise this most unscriptural profanation.

"Christians of the Church of Rome! for one moment meditate, I beseech you, on this prayer. It is not addressed to God; in it there is no mention made of Christ: having called upon the angels, and on your own soul, in the words of the Psalmist, to praise the Lord, you address your supplication to Michael himself, not even invoking him for his intercession, but imploring of him his protection. If it be said that his intercession is all that is meant, I request you, with the utmost sincerity, to judge for yourselves, whether any prayer from poor sinful man, putting his whole trust in the Lord, and imploring His help, could be addressed to our God and Saviour more immediate and direct than this? In the place of the name of his servant Michael, substitute the highest and the holiest name ever uttered in heaven or on earth, and our words form a prayer more direct to God. O Lord God Almighty, O Lord Jesus, our only Saviour, defend us in battle, that we perish not in the dreadful judgment. Hallelujah. Can this be right? Were the archangel allowed now, by his Lord and ours, to make his voice heard upon earth by Christians offering to him this prayer, would he utter any other words than the angel, his fellow-servant and ours, once addressed to St. John, when he fell down to worship before him, 'See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant; worship God.'"

Such is a specimen of the manner in which Mr. Tyler first constructs his argument of sound and hard materials and then appeals to the candour and common sense—the conscientious and deliberate conviction, of those whom he addresses. With equal ability he conducts, to a similar conclusion, the evidence from the New Testament, proving that, so far from mitigating the stringency of the former law, and countenancing any departure from the obligation of that code, which limits religious worship to God alone, it reiterates the injunction of the Old Testament against giving to another the glory due unto His name; and declares, that in order to be Christian invocation, it must be addressed to God alone. He shows, that the subtle scholastic distinction between *dulia*, or demon-worship, and *latria*, or the homage to be offered only to the Supreme Being, has no foundation excepting in the fancies of those who invented them, in order to prop a tottering hypothesis; while, as to the worship proper to the Virgin Mary, which is distinguished by the term *Hyperdulia*—a kind of mean propor-

tional between the two extremes—it is clearly shown to be a new thing, inasmuch as it is designated by a new term—a word found neither in the Scriptures, nor in any ancient classical or ecclesiastical author. On the whole, so far as the accredited word of God is concerned, the practice of saint, angel, and demon worship is proved to be utterly devoid of the slightest vestige of a foundation; and Mr. Tyler proceeds to establish the same conclusion from the evidence of primitive writers. In doing this, however, he states his motive for examining into the evidence of Christian antiquity, induced, he says, “not by any misgiving lest the testimony of Scripture might appear defective or doubtful—far less by any unworthy notion that God’s word needs the additional support of the suffrages of man. On the contrary, the voice of God in his revealed word is clear, certain, and indisputable, commanding the invocation of himself alone in acts of religious worship, and condemning any such departure from that singleness of adoration as they are seduced into who invoke saints and angels. And it is a fixed principle of our creed, that where God’s written word is clear and certain, human evidence cannot be weighed against it in the balance of the sanctuary. When the Lord hath spoken, well does it become the whole earth to be silent before Him: when the Eternal Judge himself hath decided, the witness of man bears on its very face the stamp of incompetency and presumption.” This is a sentiment to which every Protestant in heart, every true member of the Anglican Church, who credits her, in her Articles and Homilies, with saying what she meant, and with meaning what she said, will cordially respond; nor is it in the slightest degree inconsistent with the conduct of Mr. Tyler’s argument on his own principles. Enough is *already* stated, in stating the evidence of Scripture, for the satisfaction of the Anglican; but in controversy with the Romanist the opponent must himself be permitted to mark out the arena, and to choose the weapons of the conflict. “Supposing then,” says Mr. Tyler, “that the question of the invocation of saints and angels had been left by the Holy Scriptures an open question,—what evidence would have been deducible from the writings of the primitive Church? What testimony do the first years and the first ages after the canon of Scripture bear upon this point? First, it can be proved, that the Christian writers through the first three centuries and more, never refer to the invocation of saints and angels as a practice with which they were familiar; in the second place, that the principles which they habitually maintain and advocate are altogether irreconcilable with such a practice.”

The Apostolic Fathers, Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius,

and Polycarp, are first cited as witnesses in this important cause. Assuming, though not admitting, the genuineness of the writings ascribed to them; affixing to these writings in each case the highest proposed antiquity, and thus abandoning to the Romanist every controversial advantage; Mr. Tyler treats especially upon those passages which inculcate the duty of prayer, always endeavouring to find, and then thoroughly to sift, any expressions which might, with the slightest plea of justification, be urged as testimony of primitive belief and practice, in sanctioning the invocation of the saints. Ignatius, in prospect of his martyrdom, thus exhorts the Romans to pray for him: "Pray to Christ for me, that by these instruments (the teeth of the wild beasts) I may become a sacrifice of God. I do not, as Peter and Paul, command you. They were apostles. I am a condemned man. They were free, but I am still a servant." But of prayer or invocation to Peter and to Paul, Ignatius says nothing. In like manner, Polycarp commends himself, while the pile was being reared that should consume his mortal body, to the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; to the eternal High Priest Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, and to the Holy Ghost," to whom he ascribes "ALL glory;" but not a syllable occurs to justify the language, ascribed under similar circumstances, to the consecrated traitor canonized at Rome, (and we suppose about to be re-canonized at Oxford,) under the name of St. Thomas of Canterbury: "To God, and the blessed Mary, and St. Dionysius, and the Holy Patrons of this Church, I commend myself and the Church." In the undoubted relic of primitive antiquity, we have the prayer of a holy martyr, at his last hour, offered to God alone, through Christ alone. Here we find no allusion to any other intercessor; no commending of the dying Christian's soul to saint or angel. Polycarp pleads no other merits; he seeks no intercession; he prays for no aid save only his Redeemer's. In those primitive writings, then, which are called the works of the Apostolic Fathers, there is no intimation that the present belief or practice of the Church of Rome were received, or even known by Christians. Bellarmine, indeed, knowing that with ninety-nine persons out of every hundred confident assertion goes farther than conclusive argument, affirms that "all the Fathers, Greek and Latin, with unanimous consent, sanction and teach the adoration of saints and angels;" yet, instead of referring to any single passage in any of *these* remains for establishing his point, he goes off to a spurious work, which is absurdly fathered upon Dionysius the Arcopagite, but which the learned agree in ascribing to some centuries later. How forcibly are we here reminded of a parallel passage in the history of the Jewish Church: "The people served the Lord all

the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that overlived Joshua, and which had known all the great works of the Lord which he did for Israel; and there arose another generation after them, which followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them." For Joshua or for elders, read Apostles and apostolic Fathers; and for other gods, the household and local gods, the tutelary deities of the heathen (whose very statues, it is said, were in some instances converted into representations of St. Peter, and the Holy Virgin, the Jupiter Capitolinus and Bona Dea of the modern Romish mythology), and you have, *mutatis mutandis*, the history of the Church from the inauspicious era when it ceased to be Catholic and became Romish.* Luther, like Ezra, brought back the captivity, and restored the worship of the one God and only Saviour; but still the glory of the second temple is not comparable to the glory of the first, nor will it be till the Desire of all nations shall come, "with demonstration of the Spirit and of power;" and "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

Our limits will not permit us to enter into detail. Suffice it to say, that Mr. Tyler states in succession the evidence of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, Eusebius, and Athanasius, the last of whom died A.D. 373. *He* is, indeed, quoted by Dr. Wiseman as addressing the Virgin Mary in terms which we should consider as idolatrous: "Hear now, O daughter of David; incline thine ear to our prayers: grant us great gifts from the treasure of thy graces: Queen and Mother of Gods, intercede for us." But that the homily in which these words occur was falsely attributed to him, Mr. Tyler proves by the testimony of the most distinguished and accurate even of Romanist writers. The Benedictine editors, who published the remains of St. Athanasius in 1698, began their preface thus: "That this discourse is spurious, there is no learned man who does not now adjudge." Baronius declares his conviction from internal evidence, that "it could not have been written

* "What, I pray you, be such saints with us, to whom we attribute the defence of certain countries, but *Dii Tutelares* of the Gentiles idolaters? What be such saints, to whom the safeguard of certain cities are appointed, but *Dii Præsides* with the Gentiles idolaters? What be such saints, to whom, contrary to the use of the primitive Church, chapels and churches be builded and altars be erected, but *Dii Patroni* of the Gentiles idolaters? When you hear of our Lady of Walsingham, our Lady of Ipswich, our Lady of Wilton, and such other, what is it but an imitation of the Gentiles idolaters? Diana Agrotera, Diana Cophæa, Diana Ephesia, Venus Cypria, Venus Paphia, Venus Cnidia; nay, the sea and waters have as well special saints with them as they had gods with the Gentiles, Neptune, Triton, Nereus, Castor and Pollux, Venus, and such other; in whose places be come St. Christopher, St. Clement, and divers others; and specially our Lady to whom shipmen sing *Ave Maris Stella*."—(Third Part of Sermon on Peril of Idolatry.)

till after the heresy of the Monothelites had been spread abroad, at the commencement of the seventh century, three hundred years after Athanasius attended the Council of Nice." "These sentiments concerning Athanasius," he adds, "I do not think are affirmed with any detriment to the Church, for the Church does not suffer a loss on this account, who being the pillar and ground of the truth, very far shrinks from seeking, like Æsop's jackdaw, helps or ornaments which are not her own; the bare truth shines more beautiful in her own naked simplicity." "Were this principle acted upon uniformly in our discussions on religious points of faith or practice," continues Mr. Tyler, "controversy would soon be drawn within far narrower limits." At all events, he has himself set the example of the spirit and practice which he recommends. There is as much of friendly interchange of sentiment as there can be between truth and error; and we have not, in a very careful perusal, found one of his arguments which will not bear the test of a full and enlightened investigation. Sound arguments are based upon sound principles; sound principles are maintained by sound arguments.

Arguments, however, are most effectually seconded by examples and facts; and though we can hardly apply the familiar adage, in Mr. Tyler's case, that "one fact is worth a thousand arguments," yet we feel that he has both enhanced the force and illustrated the necessity of his arguments, by the facts which he has subjoined. He has exhibited the service of Thomas a'Becket—in the Romish vocabulary St. Thomas of Canterbury—as it was before the Reformation; and in so doing he comments upon the lamentable practice, revived, or attempted to be revived (for we have not yet heard that the sacrilege has been consummated), in No. 75 of the "Tracts for the Times," of substituting biographical legends for the word of God. It is true, that in the proposed matin service for March 21, Bishop Ken's day—unlike the previous specimen of the service for March 10, the festival of St. Laurence, deacon and martyr, which the Tractarian writer calls elevated and impressive—there is no direct invocation or intercession, as "Blessed Laurence, martyr of Christ, intercede for us;" or the still more hideous blasphemy which deforms the service of St. Thomas. But the practice which Mr. Tyler deprecates is commended as an integral portion of the service, and in lieu of scriptural instruction the people are to be informed, among other circumstances equally edifying, that "when the King's harbinger ordered Mrs. Eleanor Gwynn to be lodged in Ken's prebendal house at Winchester, he refused her admittance, and obliged her to seek another lodging." The Tractarian compiler of this pseudo-Pro-

testant breviary—we presume we may now say the Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin—does not “the sequel of the tale pursue,” nor relate in what words the king named Ken to fill the see of Bath and Wells—“the little fellow who would not give poor Nelly a lodging.” But we wish that some monitor would whisper into Mr. Newman’s ear the pointed and pithy questions of Mr. Tyler: “And what is the tendency of this service? What impression is it likely to make, and to leave, on minds of ordinary powers and instruction? Must it not, of necessity, tend to withdraw men from contemplating Christ, and to fix their thoughts on the powers, the glory, the exaltation, the merits of a fellow-sinner?”

We return from this digression—in which we could not resist the strong temptation of setting the principles of one Fellow of Oriel against the practice of another, and reproving the Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin out of the lips of the indefatigable Pastor of St. Giles’s—to the service before us, in which, after the usual invocation, “Pray for us, blessed Thomas,” we find the following blasphemy, of which words are wanting to express our abhorrence and indignation:—“Do thou, by the blood of Thomas, which he shed for thee, make us, O Christ, ascend, whither Thomas has ascended.”

And of this man, whom Henry the Eighth’s proclamation, dated Westminster, 16th November, in the 30th year of his reign, designates, not without cause, a “rebel and traitor to his prince,” we have the following panegyric, which, were it not execrably impious, would be unutterably absurd:—

“Hail, O Thomas, the Rod of Justice, the Brightness of the World, the strength of the Church, the love of the People, the delight of the Clergy. Hail, glorious Guardian of the Flock; save those who rejoice in thy glory.”

Surely the Reformation did not come too soon, however they who misdate heresy from Oxford may wish that it had never come at all!

It may be said, however, that while the Reformation restored the Church of Christ, it improved the Church of Rome. If it arrayed the one in shining garments, it caused the other to disrobe herself of some of the more cumbrous vestments of her superstition. Still, however, in the Breviary published at Norwich in 1830, and edited by one whose controversy with Protestant divines might have taught him a lesson of caution in the expression of his Romanism, we have a prayer, that “Andrew may be for us a perpetual intercessor;” that “the intercession of the Blessed Anthony the Abbot may commend us, that what we cannot effect by our own merits we may obtain by his patronage;” that we may be “aided by the merits of the Blessed Saturnine, the Martyr;” that

“ by the merits and prayers of the Pontiff Nicholas we may be set free from the fires of hell ;” that “ Ambrose may be our intercessor in heaven, as he was our teacher upon earth ;” and to crown all, the following prayer to the Apostle Peter, at which, if he were upon earth, we doubt not he would rend his clothes in utter indignation ; and which, with the single alteration of the name, would be fitly addressed to HIM, whom Peter, a fellow elder among elders, delighted to honour, and to whom he looked for salvation equally with, and only as, the chief of sinners. “ We believe that through the grace of the LORD JESUS CHRIST, we shall be saved even as they.”

“ O Peter, blessed Shepherd, of thy mercy receive the prayer of us who supplicate, and loose by thy word the bands of our sins ; thou to whom is given the power of opening heaven to the earth, and shutting it when open.”

Before we can affix to language such as this any milder name than blasphemy, we must not only submit the Articles of our Church to the pulverizing process adopted in Tract No. 90, which will cause them to be blown away with every wind of doctrine, but we must abjure the guidance and authority of that word, which the Chief Shepherd, Peter's Master and Lord, hath spoken, and by which He will judge us at the last day. But, however sophistry may insinuate error among Anglicans, or bigotry enforce it among Romanists, the written word is a rock which, as the one cannot overthrow, so the other cannot undermine. “ Whoever shall fall upon that rock shall be broken ; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.”

At no distant period we propose to revert to this subject, and to consider the third part of Mr. Tyler's work, which relates to the worship of the Virgin Mary, in connection with that number of the “ Tracts for the Times,” which not only recommends the Breviary as a proper companion of or sequel to the Prayer Book, but selects for the special edification of Protestants ; and “ in order to carry out in private the principle and spirit ” of our inestimable forms of prayer, the service for Sunday, June 21, in which we are thus taught to pray to the patron-saint of Mr. Newman's church in Oxford ;

“ Holy Mary, succour the wretched, help the weak-hearted, comfort the mourners, pray for the people, interpose for the clergy, intercede for the devoted women ; let all feel thy assistance who observe thy holy commemoration.”

Again :—

“ Grant, O Lord God, that we, thy servants, by the glorious intercession of the Blessed Mary, ever virgin, may be delivered from present sadness and enjoy eternal bliss.”

Mr. Newman acknowledges that these are "beyond the power of any defence;" yet he deals with them as the editors of certain classics, in usum, or rather, in corruptelam juventutis, where the prurient passages are marked by asterisks in the interpretatio, but retained in the text. We think, however, that he could scarcely have passed a more emphatic condemnation on the Breviary, than the fact, that he cannot select specimens of, what he fondly denominates, "a more elevated and impressive character," without selecting such damnable heresy. He begins by stating, in his very title, that "the Roman Breviary embodies the substance of the devotional services of the Church Catholic;" he then affirms, in the very first sentence of his Preface, that "were it skilfully set before the Protestant by Roman controversialists, it would raise a prejudice in their favour;" and yet it does not seem to occur to him, that in the mind of every real Protestant, a single supplication to the "Holy Mother of God," a single invocation of the "Blessed Martyr St. Laurence," would suffice to ensure its immediate and indignant repudiation. "The worshipping and serving the creature more than the Creator" is a delusion of the enemy, who is never more dangerous than when he "transforms himself into an Angel of Light."

We hail, therefore, Mr. Tyler's admirable work as the antidote to error no less than the advocate of truth. Happily, the writer's just reputation in his mother university is sufficiently high, his influence sufficiently powerful, to counteract, in some degree, the gravitation towards Rome which is now so fearfully developing itself in the great body of youthful academics; and which has its momentum, or moving power, in the contemplative cells of his own Oriel. To say that we cordially recommend this work, is but inadequately to express our estimate of its value, and our expectation of its usefulness. We cannot conclude our present notice more appropriately than in the words of the excellent Author himself, when we make it our earnest prayer, that it may please the Shepherd and Bishop of Souls, through the instrumentality of this work, to "pour down upon His Church the abundance of His mercy; preserving those in the truth who now practise it; restoring it to those by whom it has been lost; and imparting it to many who are yet in darkness!"

A LETTER TO THE LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER, *upon certain Symptoms of Sectarian Designs in the Pastoral Aid Society.* By J. E. N. MOLESWORTH, D.D., Vicar of Rochdale. London: *Rivingtons.* 1840.

A LETTER TO A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE CHURCH PASTORAL AID SOCIETY, *in reference to certain Animadversions.* By the Rev. JOHN HARDING, M.A. London: *Seeleys.* 1841.

A CONTROVERSY which an uninformed observer would be apt to call a strange one, has recently sprung up concerning the Church Pastoral Aid Society. A voluntary association, deriving its income solely from the contributions of individual churchmen, the bulk of whose supporters, too, are of the middle classes, and therefore naturally averse to lavish or careless expenditure,—is charged with the singular fault of being *too scrupulous in the distribution of its funds—too fearful of misapplying the means which are placed at its disposal!*

It is sufficient to state such an accusation, to assure the reader that there must be some further, some hidden motive, in advancing so unusual a charge. And that this is the case is still more clearly seen, when we observe the palpable inconsistency of the parties making it.

It was remarked, in the review of Dr. Hook's tract in our last number, that the *same parties* who now declare that a body of presbyters and laymen are not competent, of themselves, to form "a Church Society,"—intending thereby to exclude from public support the Church Missionary and Church Pastoral Aid Societies:—are zealous supporters of the Christian Knowledge Society, which was originally formed by a party of laymen! With a similar disregard of their own practice do the same persons now make it a charge against the Pastoral Aid Society, that it does,—just what the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has always done,—inquire into, and scrutinize closely, the characters of those who seek to be employed upon stipends derived from its funds.

Our limits prevent us from entering into the details of this controversy, or from referring to the circumstances which gave rise to Dr. Molesworth's and Mr. Harding's letters. We must endeavour, in the small space which remains to us, to state, as fairly and as fully as we can, the real nature of the question at issue.

An incumbent needs a curate, and, having no sufficient means to provide one at his own charge, he applies to the Church Pastoral

Aid Society for assistance, and obtains a grant. It is then left to him to select his assistant, but the society requires to be informed of the name, qualifications, and character of the person selected; and expects that its clerical committee shall be satisfied on these points, by testimony from competent referees, before the bishop is applied to for his license.

Two kinds of misrepresentations are frequently met with as to these proceedings.

It is sometimes said, that the Society rejects a candidate, after the bishop has approved him, thus setting its judgment above that of the diocesan. The fact, however, is, that the Society is most desirous of avoiding any such apparent disrespect; and therefore in all cases warns incumbents *not* to offer their candidates to the diocesan, *until* the committee and themselves shall have agreed as to their fitness and qualifications.

It is also not unfrequently reported, that a committee of *laymen* sit in judgment as to *clerical* qualifications. It has been pertinently replied, as to this point, that Dr. Hook made no objection to such lay interference, when he was a candidate for the vicarage of Leeds,—the patrons of which were five-and-twenty *laymen*, who most scrupulously inquired into the qualifications of all the candidates. In the case of the Pastoral Aid Society, however, no such interference of laymen ever takes place. The scrutiny is strictly confined to a committee of twelve clergymen, whose inquiries are conducted in the most delicate and considerate manner.

But we now come to the main objection. It is said, that the Church provides certain safeguards: the candidate's testimonials must be signed by three incumbents, and then countersigned by a bishop;—the incumbent nominating him has to satisfy himself; and, lastly, the bishop in whose diocese he is to be placed must approve the whole. It is urged, therefore, that for a voluntary society to add to all these precautions *its own* peculiar and further claim to exercise and judgment, is an assumption of episcopal or archiepiscopal authority; a claim of jurisdiction either equal or paramount to that of the diocesan; and a claim, therefore, which is wholly unchurchmanlike, and altogether intolerable.

Such is the objection with which we now propose to deal. And first, we ask, Whether Dr. Hook, or Dr. Molesworth, or any other of the objectors to the Society's practice, would themselves act on the principle which they thus attempt to prescribe for others?

They argue, that if the candidate produces his customary testimonials, signed by three incumbents, and countersigned by a bishop (which episcopal signature, be it always remembered, only certifies that the three subscribers "are beneficed clergymen, and

worthy of credit") this ought to be enough ; his admission, as far as the Society is concerned, ought to follow as a matter of course ; inasmuch as these safeguards have been considered to be sufficient by the Church, and therefore ought to be held sufficient by " a Church Society." We demand, therefore, whether Dr. Hook or Dr. Molesworth would abide by this principle in their own cases ? Would either of them, for instance, when next in want of a curate, allow us to transmit him one from London, duly provided with his " testimonials ;" and would he receive such an one as a matter of course ; assured that having " the signature of three incumbents, and the counter-signature of the bishop," he must necessarily prove all that a clergyman of the Church of England ought to be ?

We are perfectly assured that neither of these gentlemen would thus act out their own principle. They would say, and reasonably say, " No, we have many other inquiries to make before we can feel satisfied that the party is suited to our peculiar needs. These testimonials are limited, of necessity, to generalities ; we require to know a few more particulars. No document of this sort can tell us whether the party is listless and inert, or earnest and energetic. It may declare that he is not heterodox ; but it cannot assure us that he really understands, feels, and can defend the truth. It may certify that he is not dissolute or profane ; but it cannot warrant to us that he is not trifling and worldly-minded. On all these points, therefore, we must seek for fuller and further information."

For precisely the same reasons, and for still stronger ones, the Pastoral Aid Society, when it is to furnish the stipend of a curate, requires something more than the mere customary testimonials. It interposes not in the selection ; it suggests nothing, proposes nothing, leaves the incumbent to his own free volition in this matter ; but if he is so careless or so hasty as to nominate a curate of whom no one will frankly, and in a private letter of his own, declare that he is " a zealous and devoted man,"—the Society remembers that it is charged with an important trust—that its funds are painfully collected, in small sums, from the middling and even the poorer classes ; and it replies, through its clerical committee, that it cannot thus misappropriate the funds committed to its charge.

The objectors, however, here rejoin, that all this preliminary inquiry is good and desirable : but that such inquiry belongs to the incumbent choosing, and the bishop admitting, the candidate ; and that to them it ought to be left. Let us examine this argument ; first, as it regards the incumbent ; and secondly, as it regards the bishop.

1. The Incumbent. It must be assumed, to make this argument a valid one, that *all* incumbents will do their duty in this matter; that *all* will exercise as much care in the use of the Society's money, as if it were their own. But is not this assumption manifestly at variance with notorious fact?

We have already claimed Dr. Molesworth's admission—which we know he cannot withhold—that not *every* curate within the Church's pale, is such an one as he would like to employ in his own parish. We will now demand a similar concession concerning the incumbents. Dr. Molesworth will not venture to assert, that among the ten thousand beneficed clergymen of the Church of England, there are none but faithful and devoted men. He must admit that there are some careless, some superannuated, some vicious, and even some heterodox incumbents. But admitting this, how *can* he assume it to be a matter of *certainty*, that all desirable precautions will be taken by every incumbent applying for aid? If it were right or desirable to argue this question upon particular cases, we could easily shew, by a reference to the past experience of the Pastoral Aid Society, that nothing is more common than for incumbents overburdened with work, to reckon too hastily, and with too sanguine a hope, upon the zeal and fidelity of a curate offering himself to their notice, of whose very name they were probably ignorant a week before.

Incumbents, then, *do* sometimes err, *do* sometimes indulge hope without sufficient ground; and are often ready, after the expiration of a few months, to admit their error. It is *not* a safe course, therefore, to rely too confidently upon their circumspection. As far as the incumbents are concerned, the Society must not *implicitly* trust to their caution or their firmness.

2. But the Bishop. Will not this further safeguard suffice to exclude all improper persons?

It is difficult to know how to appreciate such a plea as this. Are those who use it, not aware of the ordinary practice in licensing to curacies, or are they really desirous of reasoning as if they were profoundly ignorant of this essential point in the question?

An incumbent, pressed down with labour, and longing for some immediate help, accepts, with sanguine expectation, the offer of a young man who comes to him, perhaps from a diocese two hundred miles distant, and who brings with him the ordinary testimonials, countersigned by the bishop; and also a private letter from some clerical friend, speaking favourably of the applicant. He presents the name to his own diocesan, forwarding, of course, the usual papers.

What can the bishop know of the matter? He has before him

a "testimonial," signed by three clergyman, perhaps of a see as distant as Durham from Exeter, and whose very names are quite unknown to him. The prelate of their diocese has also "countersigned" the papers,—by which countersignature, however, his lordship merely declares, that the three clergymen who have signed the paper *are* really beneficed clergymen of that diocese. The Bishop whose license is asked, naturally concludes that the incumbent nominating the applicant must have had some satisfactory assurance of his competency. Still, however, the candidate is himself an utter stranger. He therefore, if he pleases, examines him. A competent knowledge of the Greek Testament, of Butler and Paley, and Tomline and Horne, is probably found to exist; and with this the matter closes. The license is granted, and the curate proceeds to his post. But what does the bishop know—what *can* he know, in most cases, of the man's zeal and diligence—of his real seriousness and devotion to his work? Obviously nothing, or next to nothing. He may be a constitutionally idle man; or a fractious and disagreeable man; or his mind may be absorbed in Greek and Latin; or he may entertain some notions which are, at least, not consistent with the standards of the Church. In a variety of ways he may shew himself, in the course of three months, a very different sort of man from what the incumbent hoped and the bishop trusted; and the chief question with each may be, how he is to be got rid of?

Now in these descriptions we are not depicting unusual or strange occurrences. We merely speak of what is happening *every day*, and in every part of England. How, then, can any man venture to assert, that the existing safeguards in the Church are such as to exclude all improper persons from her ministry?

But if the fact be otherwise—if undesirable characters do get "testimonials" from incumbents, and licenses from bishops—then a clear and undeniable necessity is proved to exist for the establishment of some further safeguards, in the case of a voluntary association like the Church Pastoral Aid Society; by which assurance may be given to its ten thousand subscribers, that their money is not wasted in paying mere "curates," good, bad, or indifferent; but that some care is taken that every hundred pounds so bestowed shall really tend to increase the Church's efficiency, by the employment of a "zealous and devoted man."

But here comes in the last objection of which we have yet heard; namely, that in making these inquiries a party spirit may creep in, and thus the Society become an engine for the promotion of "certain peculiar views;" instead of a Catholic-spirited body, seeking, in largeness of mind, the real welfare of the whole

Church. This supposition is now very rife among us; and the hypothesis is supposed to be confirmed by a correspondence which is attached to Dr. Molesworth's letter, and which ended in the rejection of an applicant who recently applied to be admitted on one of the Society's grants.

Now of the *possibility* of this power of examination and rejection assumed by the committee, being turned to a party purpose, there can be no doubt. Almost every wholesome regulation which exists, either in Church or State, *may* be turned to a party purpose. The power possessed by a small select committee at Lincoln's Inn Fields, for instance, to provide tracts for the use of every parish in England, under the authority of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, *might be* made use of to spread this or that peculiar *ism*, whenever the advocates of such a view predominated at the board. The only safety which the public can have in such cases, consists in the responsibility of the board or committee to the whole body of the Society, and the opportunity thus given of exposing any unfair or party-coloured proceedings. That this security exists most fully in the case of the Pastoral Aid Society, is abundantly proved by the very correspondence which Dr. Molesworth has published.

It is there seen that all that the Secretary, the organ of the committee, requested, was, not a confession of faith—not an adherence to this or that view of the articles, but simply a testimony from some independent and competent judges, that the candidate was “a spiritually-minded man.”

This expression seems grievously to offend Dr. Molesworth, but surely it is a strange ground for objection. It is no shibboleth of Calvinism or Arminianism;—it is a test strictly *apostolic*. St. Paul thus draws the line (Rom. viii. 6), and we may be content to follow his example.

The late Bishop Burgess, a really “high churchman,” varied only a little from this test, when he caused an essay to be written, for the use of candidates for holy orders, “On the Signs of Conversion and Unconversion in Ministers of the Establishment.” The two classes into which the good bishop divided the clergy were,—the converted, and the unconverted. The same thing in substance is meant, when we speak, with St. Paul, of those who are “spiritually-minded,” and those who are “carnally-minded.”

Now, that the Pastoral Aid Society wishes to eschew the latter class, and to expend its funds solely on the maintenance of curates belonging to the former, is a charge which we do not wish to deny. But this is an object which Bishop Burgess would have decidedly approved; nay, it is an object which more than ten or twelve of

our bishops, by their patronage of the Society, *have* approved, and which we cannot imagine it possible for any one of our prelates to condemn. It is perfectly distinct from all attempts to encourage Calvinism or Arminianism, or any other *ism*. And if, in the *latter* sense, the Society is charged with being "a party Society," we must take leave to say, that up to this period there has not been a tittle of evidence adduced in support of such a charge.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE LAW AFFECTING THE GRANT TO MAYNOOTH.

By JAMES LORD, Esq., of the Inner Temple. London: Richards. 1841.

THIS is a work which was much needed. With a great and natural aversion to the Maynooth grant, there has been mixed up much ignorance of the real state of the case. Mr. Lord has comprised, in a neat and portable volume, the whole history of the grant; the various debates upon it; and a view of the main reasons for seeking its discontinuance.

The whole affair seems to be little else than a series of blunders. It appears almost certain that there was no intention, originally, of rendering the country liable to this annual demand; but that an incorporation by Act of Parliament, giving a legal existence where none was previously attainable, together with a little pecuniary aid at the outset, was all that was in the first instance proposed. But the Romish priesthood, when once they get admission, are not very easily persuaded to quit; and so it has proved in this case. A spirit, however, appears to be rising, which will at least put an end to their *quiet* possession, and will also, we trust, before long, break up the arrangement altogether.

Among other useful points of Mr. Lord's book, we must point out the strong array of evidence,—much of it from Romanist pens and tongues,—of the mischievous and dangerous character of this seminary of evil. We regret that his plan and narrow limits precluded any discussion on the grand fundamental question, How far a Christian government may exceed toleration, and advance towards encouragement, in the case of religious systems which it believes to be tinged with error? In some future number of this Review, we may probably endeavour to solve this difficult question.

THE LATTER DAYS OF THE JEWISH CHURCH, *as revealed in the Apocalypse.* By D. M'CAUSLAND, Esq.

THIS work belongs to the school of prophetic novelists, which has lately risen up among us. Its object is to show, that the whole of the Apocalypse is unfulfilled, and to be accomplished in the Jewish nation. Since, however, the Author does not condescend to assign any specific reasons for rejecting the common opinion of nine-tenths of previous expositors, we think it equally superfluous to refute his positions. "The erroneous views," he tells us, "of other commentators, have been left undiscussed, to sink beneath what he considers the stream of true construction." Being fully convinced ourselves, without a shade of doubt, that our Author's own views are among the most erroneous of all, and that his fundamental postulate is a pure delusion, we feel it still more superfluous to enter into a minute analysis of his work. Whenever any treatise of the same school shall come before us, with any show of argument against the larger application of the Apocalypse, we may feel it a duty to expose the emptiness of those objections, and to present, in a fuller light than has yet been done, the accumulation of internal and external proofs in its favour. But when a writer, by one stroke of his pen, would sweep away all the laborious researches of Mede, Cressener, Sir Isaac Newton, Vitranga, Bengelius, not to speak of later authors, he cannot reasonably complain if his own hasty productions meet with the same treatment. The same rashness which appears in the very opening of the work runs throughout its whole course. "The stream," for instance, "of true construction," includes the discovery, that the prophet like unto Moses is Elijah, instead of being our Lord himself, as St. Peter plainly teaches (Acts iii. 22); and that the prophecy given in Matt. xxiv. Mark xiv. has no reference whatever to the past fall of the temple and destruction of Jerusalem. We deplore greatly the appearance of every work of this crude and hasty kind, as a fresh stumbling-block to the faith of the Church in this holy prophecy; a faith already far too weak for the temptations and dangers which are now multiplying on every side. May it please God, of his infinite goodness, to guide his people into the fulness of truth as set forth in His own word, and to establish their faith beyond the power of the most subtle errors which may arise in these latter days!

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

MAY, 1841.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES, No. 90.

THE SAME. Second Edition. The corrections in the Second Edition are put in brackets. (J. H. N.)

A LETTER TO THE REV. R. W. JELF, D.D., *in Explanation of No. 90.* By the Author.

A LETTER TO THE RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD, RICHARD, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD, *on occasion of No. 90.* By J. H. NEWMAN, B.D.

A LETTER TO THE REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., *on the publication of No. 90.* By WILLIAM SEWELL. M.A. &c.

A LETTER TO THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN, *on some Passages in his Letter to the Rev. Dr. Jelf.* By N. WISEMAN, D.D., Bishop of Melipotamus. Second Edition.

WERE we required to describe, in few words, the present position of the leader in this unhappy controversy, and consequently of those who are prepared "jurare in verba magistri," we think we could not find a more appropriate or a more emphatic delineation of it than that which is afforded us by the words of Holy Writ, "They have committed two evils; they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."

This, it will be said, is a grave charge. We fear it is a charge which can be but too readily substantiated; at least if to "forsake

the fountain of living waters" is to disparage or degrade the authority of the Scripture, and to "hew out broken cisterns" is to set up in its place the authority of the Church. The "broken cistern" will "hold no water," because, while every man has a distinct perception of what is Scripture, very few (if any) can have an accurate understanding of what is the Church, or at least of what Mr. Newman understands by the appellation, when he thus employs it in section 1 of these "Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles," commencing with Articles vi. and xx. "Two instruments of Christian teaching are spoken of in these Articles, Holy Scripture and the Church." But do these Articles (vi. xx.) so express themselves, as to warrant Mr. Newman, with all his affectation of logical exactness, in classing Holy Scripture and the Church under the common appellation of "instruments of Christian teaching?" Would any one imagine from this that the one was subordinate and the other supreme; the one a fountain of living waters, the other a cistern into which it flows; the one absolute and imperative in its teaching, the other utterly devoid of power to decree or to enforce what the first does not ratify and confirm?

It is a fallacy then in the outset, and one of which the full consequences can only be discovered by a keen, and jealous, and patient scrutiny, to bring Holy Scripture and the Church before the minds of men, as joint "instruments of Christian teaching." They are no such thing. The Church is but the instrument of Holy Scripture; Holy Scripture is the instrument of God. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Has the Church, collectively regarded, been thus moved? Has it spoken under this inspiration since the age of the Apostles? Did it then so speak, excepting by the mouth of an Apostle? (Acts xv. 13—22.) Is it conceivable that the Church, in later times, *should* so speak? If so, where, how, or by whom? What, indeed, is the Church? Mr. Newman gives us a list of quotations (pages 17, 18), from Clement of Alexandria down to Estius, whom he quotes in his first edition as opposed to John Huss and *other heretics*,* as "illustrations of the phraseology" of Article xix., which denominates the visible Church "a congregation of faithful men." All his authorities, canonized and uncanonized, agree in representing the Church to be the congregation, collection, multitude, or assembly of the faithful throughout the world.

* With a tardy and reluctant discretion, Mr. Newman has expunged this authority from the good company which it kept in the first edition, and substituted in the second an opinion of the Reformers, which, however, he cannot suffer to pass without a contemptuous sneer. "And so the Reformers in their own way; for instance, the Confession of Augsburgh."

Nor is there the slightest ground of objection to the definition, which hardly required, in its simplicity, such an array of imposing and august authorities; but when did this Church ever speak one language, except the language of Holy Writ? In what has she agreed from the beginning, except in the doctrines which Holy Scripture has clearly taught, the principles it has unequivocally announced, the practice it has authoritatively enjoined? Her notes or marks are (in a passage which Mr. Newman "does not quote for all it contains," for it proves that the Church of Rome is one thing and the Church of Christ another*) "pure and sound doctrine; the sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution; and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline." Now if by the "right" is meant the "scriptural" use (and the term assuredly excludes whatever is antiscritptural, such as dominion over faith), here is another proof that the Church knows no universal language but that of Scripture, and that it is a fallacy to speak of "two instruments of Christian teaching," when in fact there is but ONE; whether we may choose to designate it as the Church teaching by Holy Scripture, or Holy Scripture teaching by the Church.

The fallacy, however, which lies concealed in Mr. Newman's "two instruments of Christian teaching," consists not only in confounding their essence, but also in not accurately distinguishing their relations. Either the Church is the test of Holy Scripture, or Holy Scripture is the test of a true Church. Mr. Newman and his disciples, quasi-Romanists and Romanists, hold the former. Protestants, or rather Primitives, for we may reckon among their number a certain personage once called Saul of Tarsus, resolutely affirm the latter. We know not how little the authority of this obscure writer may avail with Mr. Newman's school in comparison of St. Austin, and other saints of human fabrication, and of later date, who have since graced or disgraced the Romish Calendar; but we understand him to desire that the faith of his converts "might stand, not in the power of men, but in the wisdom of God—the wisdom which," he said, "we speak; and if I, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Where Paul, therefore, denies both the right of an Angel, and his own right as an Apostle, Protestants deny the right of the Church. The Apostles' creed, which Mr. Newman defines to be the "summary of apostolic tradition," and pronounces to constitute the Rule of Faith, is no otherwise binding upon the conscience of an Anglican than "as it may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture;" and though Mr.

Newman cites Usher, Taylor, Laud, Bramhall, and Field, to prove that Scripture is not the "Rule of Faith," his very citations, for the most part, are such as resolve all the value of the creed into its connection with and conformity to, or rather its derivation from and demonstration by, Scripture. Concerning the Holy Scriptures, Bishop Taylor, as cited by Mr. Newman himself, affirms, "That the Scripture is a full and sufficient rule to Christians in faith and manners is therefore certain, because *we have no other*." Whatever Taylor may affirm concerning the creed, therefore, as a Rule of Faith, it is clear that he only regards it in this light, in so far as it is the epitome or representative of Scripture, and consequently he cannot be fairly reckoned among the supporters and advocates of Mr. Newman's conclusion: "In the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture, it is plain, is not, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith."* Like a prudent general, Mr. Newman has here made provision for a timely retreat, under the ambiguity of the first clause of his assertion, for his notion of the sense in which the term "Rule of Faith" is understood at this day may be as peculiar to himself as his method of interpreting the Articles; but so far as we are able to judge of the common understanding, we affirm the direct contrary, as equally plain; and if it were not so, Anglican principles would not be the principles of those who "continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine;" nor would the Anglican Church be, as we believe she is, "based upon the foundation which God hath laid, and other than which man cannot lay,"—the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.

One of Mr. Newman's reasons for dispensing with the phrase, Rule of Faith, as applied to Holy Scripture, is, "on the ground of its being ambiguous;" and another, "that it is thus used in a novel sense." Mr. Newman's words may imply, either that the phrase itself, or that Scripture, regarded as a rule, is ambiguous; but, in either case, the objection extends equally to the Apostles' creed. Either this formulary is scriptural, or it is not. If it is,† how can it but partake the ambiguity of that which it professes to represent? If it is not, then, in order to become a rule imperative and absolute, it must be imposed upon the conscience by

* Page 11.

† That the creed is "ambiguous," wherever, from the necessity or nature of the subject, Scripture is so, will appear from the variety of opinions mentioned in Bishop Pearson's commentary, especially under the article, "descended into hell." And as to the "Holy Catholic Church," if all agreed in understanding it to be "*cætus fidelium*," what would be the various definitions of "*fidelium*" by the representatives of four sections of "Catholicity," Martin Luther, John Calvin, the modern Titular of Tuam or even the Bishop of Melipotamus, and Mr. Newman?

some co-equal and co-ordinate authority with that which imposed Holy Scripture; and is the ambiguity lessened by the introduction of that most fluctuating and equivocal of all authorities, tradition, even though it be termed "apostolical?" As to the novelty, we hear nothing of the Apostles' creed for the first three centuries, while we have always understood Holy Scripture to be the Rule or Canon of which the Apostle spoke, when he exhorted the Church at Philippi, whereunto they had already attained, "to walk by the same rule;" and when he expressed his affectionate desire that peace and mercy might be on as many of the Galatians as "walked according to this rule," i.e. Scripture explained and applied by him to the doctrine of the new creation in Christ Jesus). But this we must suppose is not the *common* understanding; at least it is not Mr. Newman's. Still, we cannot but consider it as perfectly compatible with the language of One who thus interceded for his own, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth."

Men's minds, however, being unsettled respecting the mode in which the Church is to discharge her office as a Teacher; when, where, and how she is to speak; how the pervading phantom of these pages, Catholicity, is to find audible and authoritative utterance—how General Councils, which seem to be Mr. Newman's Vox Dei, are to be gathered, not only according to the commandment and will of princes, but in the name of Christ; how it is to be ascertained that they are a "thing of heaven;" their "infallibility" being thus guaranteed, their "deliberations over-ruled," and their "decrees authoritative;" all these points being undetermined, and, so far as Mr. Newman has yet shewn, undeterminable, he considers it the province of an Anglican Presbyter, in commenting upon the Articles, to render men's minds equally unsettled, if he can, in regard to the province, the efficiency, the authority and even the integrity of Scripture. First, professing to illustrate Articles vi and xx, he argues that certain canonical books were not always canonical; next, that certain books which are not canonical may yet be not uninspired; then, "that our received version is not imposed on us a true comment on the original text, and has no claim upon our *interior consent*;" and, lastly, that there is no standard to determine whether the Scripture be interpreted rightly or not, except *that* be a standard which it is difficult for many to understand, and impracticable, we believe, for any to apply—Catholicity—"quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." In order, therefore, to be an intelligent member of Mr. Newman's Church Catholic a man must be perfectly versed in the Church history of every age, from the time when "grievous wolves" arose out of the conclave of Presbyters at Ephesus, "speaking perverse

things to draw away disciples after them"—he must be acquainted with the original languages of Holy Scripture, which alone can have a claim upon his "*interior consent*"—he must be competent to determine between books which are canonical and inspired: books, which are inspired, though uncanonical; and books, which are neither canonical nor inspired—or else, for he cannot do without a "Rule," he must take the creed, because it is presented to him by the Church, without presuming to inquire whether it is conformed to, or consistent with, the Holy Scriptures. What Mr. Newman's intentions are in adopting this style of commentary, must be of course best known, and only known, to his own conscience; but we can conceive nothing so likely to prepare the way of Romanism, and make its paths straight, as to level the barrier which the Holy Scripture has ever opposed to the perilous practice of "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," and thus enabling a Church, which term—as in the instance of Rome, is the substitution of a part for the whole—to assume "dominion over faith." What was the standard of interpretation when the Bereans, whom Paul eulogized for their nobleness of mind, tested his ministry by "searching the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so," cannot be doubtful for an instant; it was their own understanding of the plain and literal import of the words of Holy Writ—and why the course, which was not only lawful but laudable when inspiration was *proved* and *manifested*, should become illicit and censurable where inspiration is only *claimed*, Mr. Newman may demonstrate to his own satisfaction, but we think he will not find it so easy to demonstrate to the satisfaction of those who exercise reason, the noblest of God's gifts in nature, in order to apprehend Revelation, his choicest, worthiest gift to the soul. "For faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God—and this is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."

Thus then the student in Mr. Newman's school of pseudo-catholic theology is brought by the remarks in Section First, which deny that the Anglican version of the Bible has any claim upon the "*interior consent*" of the members of the Anglican Church, into a condition of bewilderment like that of Croesus or Æacides, when either received the equivocal response from the juggling oracle of "heathenesse." He finds, first, that Scripture is *not* a rule of faith; then that, in fact, he does not know what is Scripture—then that, if there *be* a rule, it is the Apostles' creed—and this, not because it is deduced from Scripture, but because it was adopted two centuries after the canon of Scripture had been finally closed, by "Catholic consent." This must be rather startling to an Anglican,

whose Church, when enjoining him to receive the creed, had assigned as the reason *why* he was to receive it, "because founded on most certain warrant of Holy Scripture;" thus maintaining, *a fortiori*, the superiority, the supremacy of Scripture, as both constituting and confirming the authority of the creed. This, however, is a fit introduction to the Second Section, which is designed to shew, that an assent to the doctrine, that we are justified by faith only, "does not imply a denial of Baptism as a means and an instrument of justification;" nor yet preclude the doctrine of works justifying also. Neither of these points are touched in the creed, which therefore on Mr. Newman's system *may* be our rule; they are both decided in Holy Scripture, and therefore Scripture may not. The truth is, that Baptism and Good Works stand in precisely the same relation to Faith,—that of subordinates, accessories, evidences, or effects. In the case of an adult, "belief with all the heart" is a pre-requisite for Baptism; in the case of a child, which cannot receive intelligently that Holy Sacrament, Baptism is made, as to its full efficacy, conditional on faith;* and good works, which God hath ordained us to walk in, are simply the recognition and observance of the baptismal vow. Instead therefore of saying, with Mr. Newman, "that faith only may justify in one sense, and good works in another" (which sentence we observe, in passing, is an example of equivocal and evasiveness too common with Mr. Newman; for we cannot tell whether he means good works only, or good works in connection with faith,) how much better is it to confine ourselves to the "wholesome doctrine" of the Article, which can be attended with no obscurity to those who regard Baptism as the profession of faith commenced; the Lord's Supper as the profession of faith repeated; good works as the profession of faith continued and confirmed—and whose comfort is to believe from Scripture, though they do not find it in the creed, "that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law—for by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified."

Section 3, on Articles xii and xiii, is intended to shew that "works before justification, when done by the influence of divine aid, gain grace"—and the title of the Article is drawn into the text, that Mr. Newman's case against it may appear more plausible. "Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit [before justification, *title of the article*,] are not pleasant to God—nor do they make man meet to receive grace." The brackets and the italics here are Mr. Newman's, and they are used

* Faith, whereby infants believe the promises of God, as made to them in this sacrament, is promised for them by their sponsors, which promise, when they come to age, they themselves are bound to perform.

to make the Church seem to say what she does *not* say, in order, we presume, that this subtle controversialist may obtain the semblance of an advantage in appearing to refute her. The real point at issue, and which the Church does not decide, is *where justification begins*—whether in the actual communication of the grace of Christ, or when the individual first becomes conscious of it—whether for example, in the case of Cornelius, it was contemporaneous with the first prayer that rose warm from his heart to God, or took place when the Holy Ghost fell upon him previously to the administration of baptism, or in the Sacrament of baptism itself—and similarly, in the case of the Ethiopian Eunuch, whether justification began, when he realized that faith in prophecy which turned his steps toward Jerusalem; or when his heart burned within him under the exposition of Philip; or not until he went down with the Evangelist into the water and was baptized. One instance is on record where justification was complete by faith without baptism, that of the penitent malefactor—and it were a presumptuous thing to affirm, an uncharitable thing to suppose, that the written word has never since operated in genuine and effective conversion to God, where the means of receiving the Sacrament of Baptism have not been afforded—or where, as in the slave-countries, they have been withheld. Our Church therefore, in accordance with Scripture, affirms “justification by faith alone;” regarding due observance of the Sacraments and devout obedience to the commandment, as the natural and necessary fruits of faith. She neither denies, nor defines, “the state between that of justification and grace, and that of neither;” her position is simply, that where there is no grace of Christ, and no inspiration of the Spirit, there is no really good work. She denies not, that works before justification may nevertheless be done under a divine influence; but she *does* deny that works not done under a divine influence can be good works—and herein she does but embody the tenor of the Saviour’s declaration, that “as the branch cannot bear fruit except it abide in the vine,” no more can man do works pleasing to God, unless engrafted upon Christ. On the fact of works without grace being valueless, she insists; concerning the time and the manner in which grace may be given, she is wisely and discreetly silent.

Section 4, on the visible church, Article xix., we pass over with brief comment, for we really do not see what Mr. Newman has added to this “ambiguous formulary,”—for such is the designation which he affixes to the Articles, and he has assuredly done his utmost to prove the justice of it in his own case, by his certainly not less ambiguous comment. Giving some “illustrations of the phraseology of the Article, they plainly shew,” he continues,

"that it (the Article) is not laying down any logical definition of what a church is, but is describing, and as it were pointing to the Catholic Church throughout the world, which being but ONE, cannot possibly be mistaken, and requires no other account of it beyond this simple and majestic ONE." We suppose the latter of these "*ones*" refers to the account of the Article, but the sentence is very loosely expressed; and we do not quite understand Mr. Newman when he says that the visible church cannot possibly be mistaken, considering what various opinions exist respecting the nature of the distinctive marks or notes by which she is to be identified, the preaching of the pure word, and the due administration of the sacraments; and how many are eager to exclude those who differ on points of discipline from the pale of the visible Church, as though they could enhance the excellency of the kingdom of grace in exact proportion as they should circumscribe its boundaries. We cannot quite make up our minds to exclude from the *cœtus fidelium* spoken of in the Article "kirk, or connection, or other communion"—we cannot—nor does the Anglican Church require it of us—regard any man as "Anathema Maran-atha" unless he loves not the Lord Jesus Christ.

Section 5, on General Councils, admits that, according to the Article, they are fallible; but Mr. Newman goes on to affirm, that under certain conditions, which fulfil his notion of a "gathering in the name of Christ," they will be infallible. He quotes Gregory Nazianzen (we hope there is no profaneness in omitting the prefix St.) to shew that these conditions were fulfilled in "the Holy Council of Nicæa"—but what they are, he adds, "it is not necessary here to determine. Some have included among these conditions the subsequent reception of its decrees by the universal Church—others, a ratification by the Pope." Whether Mr. Newman *himself* includes this last among the conditions, he does not tell us; but he *does* mention another, though without comment, which makes us wonder that he can still continue, even in name, an Anglican. The Article goes on to require that in points necessary to salvation, a council should prove its decrees by Scripture. Now to whom could the proof be addressed but to those on whom the decrees are binding? Surely then, if private judgment is to be the interpreter of the decrees of an infallible council, it may be considered equally competent to the application of Scripture, as the "Rule of Faith."

It is, however in section 6, headed, "Purgatory, Pardons, Images, Relics, Invocation of Saints," and purporting to be an illustration of Article xxii., that we find a double portion of those qualifying brackets, which are intended to dilute, in the second edition, the concentrated essence of Romanism in the first; a spirit, which

made the potion too powerful even for the nerves of the Professor of Moral Philosophy himself. Mr. Sewell complains, in his half expostulatory, half eulogistic letter to his "dear Pusey," that "this is not the tone in which our greatest divines have been accustomed to speak of the Church of England, especially as distinguished from the Church of Rome." At the same time, he prefaces and neutralizes this qualified censure by saying, that "he is describing only the impression on his own mind, and not presuming to assert that he has caught the real meaning of the Author." We do not wonder at this, for one or two of Mr. Newman's statements, as we shall presently shew, are as enigmatical as if they had issued from the sphinx herself, or the oracular tripod of the double-dealing Delphi. It must be no small consolation to plain people, however—who rise from the perusal of this Tract bewildered and perplexed, neither understanding what Mr. Newman says nor whereof he affirms—that there are some things in the book which baffle the penetration of the quick-witted Author of "Christian Morals" himself. But now let us hear the Article:—

"The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of angels as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God."

The first remark we have to make upon this concerns the scholar. The Articles being originally written in Latin (the language of theological controversy at the time of the Reformation) Mr. Newman has, with much appearance of candour, introduced between brackets certain Latin words, of which the translation might not seem sufficiently explicit or emphatic—as if to throw all possible light on the subject. But why, we would ask, has he omitted the most remarkable instance of this in the whole Article? Every body knows that the phrase "rather repugnant" might be taken to mean *slightly* repugnant—and the Popish Bishop Baines finding it convenient to assume this sense, has thought fit to designate it a "timid phraseology." Mr. Newman ought, therefore, on the principle of "audi alteram partem" to have introduced between the brackets the word "immo"—the force of which is equivalent to, "nay, on the contrary, it contradicts the word of God!"—assuredly as strong an expression of disapprobation as the most zealous Protestant could desire, and as Mr. Newman himself could deprecate.

Passing this, however, as might be expected, sub silentio, Mr. Newman dwells on the inference, "that the doctrine here objected to is the Romish doctrine. Of course, the Article never meant to make light of every doctrine about pardons (de indulgentiis) but

the Romish doctrine [as indeed the plural form itself shews."] What this qualifying bracket, which appears in the second edition only, is intended to add in the way of confirmation to Mr. Newman's confident sequitur "of course," we really do not understand; but what *does* appear from the Article, regarding it as a plain statement, not an "ambiguous formulary," is this. That a doctrine about *pardon*, in the view of the Anglican Church, is one thing, and a doctrine about *pardons* another; and that every doctrine which recognizes MORE THAN ONE PARDON—that which is through the all-atoning blood of Christ—in her judgment, is a fond thing. "A verification" of such an understanding of the Article (as Mr. Newman's) he says is afforded by—or, according to the δευτέρα φρονις, of the second edition, "such an understanding of the Article is supported by"—what? some sentences of the Homily on Peril of Idolatry, of which, and of the Homilist, Mr. Newman can speak slightly enough when it suits his purpose,* yet he here takes it to VERIFY the Article. And by what is this verification sustained? "By a certain veneration sanctioned by its tone in speaking of relics, in which the writer does not commit himself to the miracles at Epiphanius's tomb, nor the discovery of the true cross, but he evidently wishes the hearer to think he believes in both." And this is the JUDGMENT of the Homilies. One would have thought Mr. Newman might have found a passage which is quite as explicit in its language and much more decisive in its judgment than this. Since, however, he has not thought proper to do so, we will endeavour to supply the deficiency. "In this they" (the Papists) pass the folly and wickedness of the Gentiles, that they honour and worship the relics and bones of our saints, which prove that they be mortal men, and dead, and therefore no gods to be worshipped, which the Gentiles would never confess of their Gods for very shame. Is this agreeable to St. Chrysostom, who writeth thus of relics, "Do not regard the ashes of the saints' bodies, nor the relics of their flesh and bones, consumed with time; but open the eyes of thy faith, and behold them clothed with heavenly virtue, and the grace of the Holy Ghost, and shining with the brightness of the heavenly light. But our idolaters found too much vantage of relics and relic-water, to follow St. Chrysostom's course. And because relics were so gainful, few places there were but they had relics provided for them. And for more plenty of relics, some one saint had many heads, one in

* An iron yoke indeed you would forge for the conscience if you oblige us to assent, not only to all matters of doctrine which the Homilies contain, but even to their opinion concerning the fulfilment of prophecy. Why, we do not ascribe authority in such matters even to the unanimous consent of all the Fathers.—(p. 67.)

one place, and another in another place. Some had six arms and twenty-six fingers. And where our Lord bare his cross alone, if all the pieces of the relics were gathered together, the greatest ship in England would scarcely bear them.—O wicked, impudent, and most shameless men, the devisers of these things.—Now God be merciful to such miserable and silly Christians, who by the fraud and falsehood of those which should have taught them the way of truth and life, have been made not only more wicked than the Gentiles idolaters, but also no wiser than horses, asses, and mules, which have no understanding.” (Peril of Idolatry, part 3.)

This, we think, is something more like a deliberate and decided judgment than the passage so jesuitically characterized by Mr. Newman, as “not incompatible with a certain toleration of relics,” and we shall find that the same may be proved respecting the sister proposition—“neither is all doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, images, and saints” (Mr. N. ought to have said, invocation of saints) “condemned by the Article, but only the Romish.”

Three doctrines respecting purgatory which the Article does *not* condemn are here specified by Mr. Newman; first, “that the conflagration of the world, or the flames which attend the Judge, will be an ordeal through which all men will pass—that great saints, such as St. Mary will pass it unharmed; that others will suffer less; but none will fail under it who are built on the right foundation. Second, That the cleansing is *pœna damni*, but not *pœna sensus*: not a positive sensible infliction, much less the torment of fire, but the absence of God’s presence. Third, That the purgatorial cleansing is but a progressive sanctification, and has no pain at all. None of these does the Article condemn: what it *does* reprobate,” says Mr. Newman, “is the notion of a purgatory, in which our state could be changed, in which God’s decrees could be reversed.” And then he quotes, as specimens of what the Article condemns—what we do not choose to quote here, as suggesting loose and ludicrous ideas in connection with the grave and awful circumstances of the state of disembodied souls; but what those who are curious in such matters may read in pp. 27, 28 of this Tract. We cannot bring ourselves to sully our paper with such monstrous absurdities, which have just the same relation to the graver and less unpalatable variations of the doctrine, as the first article in our Table of Prohibited Degrees to all that follow it, *that a man must not marry his grandmother*. If the Table began and ended with this prohibition, it would not be worth the trouble of affixing to our church walls; and so the Article, if it only condemned what Mr. Newman has declared it to reprobate, would be worth little more. We think, however, that

its true meaning may be elicited from that standard of Church principles and doctrines, which Mr. Newman has condescended to except by name from his contemptuous designation of "ambiguous formularies." "In the expression ambiguous formularies," he says in his letter to Dr. Jelf, "I did not think of referring to the Prayer Book." We are very glad of it—for we should like to know which of his three kinds of purgatory he can reconcile with the declaration of the Church in her burial service, "that the souls of the faithful when they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity?" "What mean our hymns," asked St. Chrysostom—"Do we not glorify God, and give him thanks, that he hath crowned them who are departed—that he hath delivered them from trouble; that He hath set them free from all fear?" No, says Mr. Newman, "it may be held by the Anglo-Catholic, as a matter of private belief," that the souls of them that depart hence in the Lord are not in joy and felicity, but in experience or in expectancy of a fiery ordeal—suffering under the absence of the presence of God. How can the Anglo-Catholic hold this, and yet celebrate the obsequies of the departed according to the ritual of our Church?

We give Mr. Newman's summing up, which occurs only in the second edition, as a specimen of the occasional obscurity of his style; a style, which always, we suppose, has a meaning, but often smothers it, whether designedly or not, under such a mass of words, that it requires more than one perusal to extract and excavate the sense.

"Let it be considered then whether on the whole the Romish doctrine of purgatory which the Article condemns, and which was generally believed in the Roman Church three centuries since as well as now, viewed in its essence, be not the doctrine, that the punishment of unrighteous Christians is temporary, not eternal; and that the purification of the righteous is a portion of the same punishment, together with the superstitions, and impostures for the sake of gain, consequent thereon." Doubtless it is, but is this *all* that the Article condemns? Mr. Newman may be pleased so to interpret its "ambiguous" expressions; we trust that the majority even of *his* readers will farther consider whether it does not denounce every doctrine of an intermediate probationary or preparatory state, which is "grounded on no certain warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant (altogether contradictory) to the word of God."

Precisely the same mental reservation is discernible under the other heads of this section. The "doctrine of pardons which the Article condemns," says Mr. Newman, "is only the Romish

doctrine, that remission of sins in the next life may be obtained by the power of the Pope"—what doctrine of pardons the Article does *not* condemn, Mr. Newman cautiously forbears to state. Similarly with regard to veneration or worshipping of images "That the Homilies do not altogether discard reverence towards relics has already been shown"—no where that we can find, except in the single dubious quotation which has been already disposed of—and hence he concludes that the Article means, which it does; and insinuates that it *only* means, which we think it does *not*, "all maintenance of those idolatrous honours which have been and are paid them so commonly throughout the Church of Rome, with all the superstitions, profanities, and impurities consequent thereon;" but not such pure and chaste attempts, as those of Mr. Newman, to "gain the favour of the blessed saints." The fourth and last head, however, that of Invocation of Saints, launches forth two of Mr. Newman's most polished and subtle weapons, which we shall endeavour to repel by objecting the Scriptural shield of Truth. And then, dismissing Mr. Newman and No. 90 with a few observations, we shall conclude with a brief view of the present state of the controversy; at least of those who have come to the rescue, and thus identified themselves, in whole or in part, with this self-constituted representative of "Anglo-Catholicity."

"By invocation is not meant," says Mr. Newman, "the mere circumstance of addressing beings out of sight, because in our Church service we employ the Psalms, the Benedicite, and the Benedictus. Nor is it a fond invocation to pray that unseen beings may bless us, for this Bishop Ken does in his Evening Hymn." (Does Mr. Newman mean to argue that Bishop Ken was infallible?) "Nor, if we mean nothing by them, addressing them to beings which we know cannot hear, as when the Homilist says, 'that a godly man might justly, from zealous indignation, cry out, O heaven, O earth, O seas!' what madness and wickedness are men fallen into." These are Mr. Newman's premises; and his conclusion, as stated in the *second* edition, is, that [by the doctrine of the invocation of saints the article means all maintenance of addresses to them which intrench upon the incommunicable honour due to God alone]. Of this again we entertain not the least doubt; but is this *ALL* it means? Does it not equally intend such as the following, taken from Mr. Newman's own "elevated and impressive specimens" of the Breviary in Tract 75:—"I beseech thee, Blessed Mary, ever virgin, the blessed Michael Archangel, the blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all Saints, and you, my Brethren, to pray the Lord our God for me. Pray for us, Holy Mother of God. Blessed Laurence,

Martyr of Christ, intercede for us?" We do not affirm that these invocations "trench upon the incommunicable honour due to God alone;" but we *do* affirm that there is not the vestige of a precedent for them in the word of God. We hear nothing there of "Holy James, pray for us; Holy Stephen, intercede for us;" though the one belonged to the glorious company of the Apostles, to whom had been secured, by express promise, twelve thrones, from which they should judge the tribes of Israel; and the other was the leader of that noble army of martyrs, which the venerable John beheld in white robes, made white by the blood of the Lamb, before the throne of God. Surely, in the interval of thirty years which interposed between these events and the later Epistles of St. Paul, there would have been ample time to have noticed this practice; nor could a fairer opportunity have presented itself than when the Apostle is pointing the attention of the Hebrews, to the "great cloud of witnesses" by whom they were compassed about. He bids them look,, however, not to these, but to Jesus, the Author and Finisher of their faith; and to consider Him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest they "be wearied and faint in their minds." For the qualified invocation, therefore, which Mr. Newman insinuates rather than recommends (for his favourite mode of arguing consists in selecting a practice which all deem unlawful, proving that we may *not* do this, but that the Articles justify us in doing every thing *short* of this), there is no foundation whatever in that Scripture, which the Anglican Church declares to comprehend all things necessary to salvation; nor do General Councils, which have erred, and may err; nor does the Church Catholic herself, whose voice (so far as she has a voice) they are, possess any authority whatever to enforce them upon men's consciences as "requisite or necessary to salvation."

It is needless, however, to pursue our examination further, for the charge with which we set out has already been more than established, that Mr. Newman has systematically and deliberately "forsaken the fountain of living waters." His illustrations of the Articles, thus far, have not contained a single reference to Scripture, except one which appeared in the first edition, page 36, to Rev. i. 4, and which has been expunged in the second, to make room for the authority of "Ken, Bishop and Confessor." Mr. Newman's argument, however, loses little by it, for it is at best a very fanciful exposition. "It is not unnatural, if the seven Angels before the throne have sent us, through St. John the Evangelist, grace and peace, that we, in turn, should send up our thoughts and desires to them." It is not a little remarkable, that this single citation should be inaccurately—we will not say disin-

genuously—given, for the expression of the Evangelist is, “the seven SPIRITS which are before the throne,”—an expression susceptible of a very different application from Mr. Newman’s, who is perfectly aware, that though all Angels are Spirits, yet it does not follow that every Spirit is an Angel; and that this passage is often explained concerning the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit, in accordance with Zech. iii. 9, and Isaiah xi. 2.* We can only infer that Mr. Newman is already convinced of the truth of three propositions, which about the time of the appearance of this Tract were announced as subjects of “Lectures by the Very Rev. Dr. Kirwan, at the Catholic Chapel, St. Mary, Moorfields.”

1. That there must have been constituted by some infallible judge a rule to decide all controversies of faith, in which all followers of Christ are bound to subscribe.

2. That the Scriptures are not this judge or rule, constituted by Christ to decide on subjects of controversy.

3. That the Church is the judge, constituted by God to decide all controversies in faith.

But what again is the Church? Where shall we find it? Are we to look for its utterance with Dr. Kirwan and the Bishop of Melipotamus! (a *verbum sesquipedale*, fit for the designation of one whose attribute it is, *projicere ampullas*) to the City of the seven hills, the centre and metropolis of Romish Catholicity; or to Oxford, the centre and metropolis of Anglo-Catholicity, whence are promulgated what Professor Sewell pompously says, “we call Church principles?” Will Mr. Gladstone, a layman, come to the rescue of the clergy, and tell us where he finds that “magnificent conception, the power of the Church incorporated on earth?” Not at Rome, for an extract from the Homilies, given by Mr. Newman himself, page 33 (and he acknowledges it is only one specimen out of several), implies that, in the view of the Anglican Church, the Bishop of Rome is Antichrist; not at Oxford, for Anglo-Catholics here, as in all other parts of heretical England, lie under the ban of more than fifty anathemas; and the Bishop of Melipotamus, though he chants the *Io Pæan*, in anticipation of the approaching downfall of heresy, is not yet, we suppose, invested with power to take them off. The very designations of Church of England, Church of Scotland, Church of Rome, indicate the absurdity of looking to her whom Mr. Newman calls “the Spouse of Christ” (a title, we think, applicable only to the spiritual and invisible Church, the whole family which in heaven and earth is named of

* We find that Mr. Newman himself has retracted this inaccuracy in the postscript to his Letter to Dr. Jelf. “The passage itself,” he says, “perhaps had better be omitted.” Does he think that there can be a second opinion on the subject?

Christ), for any authoritative utterance in matters of controversy. Certain it is, that the "*tria virginis ora*," if now consulted on any matter of faith, would pour forth a dissonant and discordant answer, "without distinction in the sound." How much better, therefore—how much more rational—how much more consoling—how much more consistent with real Catholicity, to fall back upon the sure foundation which God hath laid; to consult the unerring oracle, which employs one and the same language to all who may enquire of it in sincerity and truth; to embrace freely the gospel of grace, as that which alone bringeth salvation; and to stay ourselves upon the thought, that while creeds are many, and churches not a few, "the foundation of the Lord standeth sure, having this seal: The Lord knoweth those that are His, and let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity."

We have devoted so much space to the spring and source of this unhappy controversy, that we can do no more than allude briefly to the subsidiary pamphlets which are launching rapidly upon the ocean of strife. First and foremost, Mr. Newman has sent out two lighter craft; one, a Letter addressed to Dr. Jelf, in which the writer takes credit to himself for "having done all he could to keep members of the Church from straggling in the direction of Rome!!" and a Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, professedly in answer to a verbal communication from his lordship, requiring or recommending the discontinuance of the Tracts. We cannot help thinking, however, that Mr. Newman is not altogether indifferent to the effect which may be produced in the minds of his disciples, if not of the public, by making a parade of his personal familiarity with the Bishop, and by insinuating that his lordship was actuated less by disapprobation of the opinions expressed in the Tracts, than by the urgency of the pressure from without. In a communication of this nature, designed for the public eye, a different mode of address was surely more becoming the respective position of the parties, with which alone the generality of readers are concerned. Next comes the pamphlet of Professor Sewell, which does not seem to define very exactly the intentions of the writer, unless it be to tell the world, that he once "interposed to allay the irritation and alarm which had been raised against Dr. Pusey and others by false and silly charges;" but that with all conceivable respect for the Tractarians, he cannot do so in the present instance—because, we suppose, the charges brought against No. 90 by the Four Tutors, and afterwards by the Hebdomadal Board are neither false nor silly. One passage however is entitled to attention, for it illustrates the value of these Church Principles as emanating from a body, whose claim to represent the

English Church reminds us involuntarily of that of the three tailors of Tooley-street to represent the English people.*

“It is dangerous for any body of individuals, however small, to combine to disseminate peculiar religious opinions within the Church. It becomes still more dangerous when these works have, however improperly, acquired a name which compromises a great public University in no way responsible for them, and when they are put forth anonymously, and apparently with the sanction of the whole body.”

Yet Mr. Sewell subsequently calls this “a movement making in defence of the Church and of her principles.” We doubt how even his logical ingenuity will reconcile this with the inference deducible from his previous words. “If I have ever maintained similar principles with the Tracts, it is so far only as I believed them to be the principles of the Church of England. But the publication of Tract 90 has caused me the most serious pain;” ergo, I do not believe Tract 90 to be the principles of the Church of England. We should be most astonished if he did!

Dr. Hook has also taken part in this controversy, but we must not identify him with Mr. Newman’s extreme opinions. He tells us that he did not approve of this particular Tract;—nay, that he had actually determined to write a pamphlet exposing the errors of No. 90; but “as soon as he heard that the Author was to be silenced, not by argument, but by usurped authority, that moment he determined to take his stand with him:” that is to say, he would become the advocate of “errors,” rather than not resist what he terms “usurped authority;” the authority of the Vice-Chancellor, Heads of Houses, and Proctors, pronouncing on the violation of their own academical statutes. Of course, thus pre-disposed to be easily satisfied, we cannot wonder that “Mr. Newman’s explanatory letter to Dr. Jelf is to his mind perfectly satisfactory”—(a letter in which the writer affirms his persuasion that “the view which he has taken of the Articles is true and honest!!”)—and holding as he does that under existing circumstances we must become party-men, he professes his adherence to those High Church principles, of which “the vicious extreme is Popery.” His distinction is as follows:—

“The distinguishing principle of the Low Church party is the assertion of the sufficiency of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture. The High Church party take Holy Scripture for their guide, and in the interpretation of it defer to the authority of primitive antiquity. The Low Church party contend for the sufficiency of private judgment. But if the sufficiency of private judgment be admitted, it follows that there is but one heresy, and that is the rejection of Holy Scripture as the Word of God.”

* Mr. Newman himself refers at the close of his Tract to the political world for an illustration in point. And a most pointed illustration it is! It would form an excellent enigma:—Why were the Reformers of the English Church like a French minister of modern days?

Does Dr. Hook mean to assert that those whom he terms "Low Church" are altogether regardless of primitive antiquity? Does he really believe that those, who, equally with himself, have subscribed the Articles, *ex animo*, without the expansive construction of Mr. Newman on the one side, or the contraction of a disingenuous reserve on the other, can possibly hold, that "if they receive the Scriptures, they are safe, whatever construction they put upon them?" Are they not, as members of the Anglican Church, as much committed on all essential doctrines to a particular construction, as Dr. Hook himself; and does not the tendency to Socinianism necessitate departure from the Church? Dr. Hook acknowledges that "the soul-destroying heresy of Socinianism is now almost extinct"—can he say as much of "the vicious extreme" of the other party? Does he really believe that there is a preponderance of Socinians in the parishes of those whom he terms Low Churchmen, those who support and sanction that object of his extreme aversion—*ἰμὸν μισσημα*—the Pastoral Aid Society?—In one respect he has spoken out, and we thank him for it. The root of all heresies, if not the "one heresy," is "the rejection of Holy Scripture," or of any portion of it, as the word of God. Now there are certain portions which the Socinian, as Dr. Hook well knows, does reject; while the Low Churchman takes the Scriptures in their integrity. He takes them as a whole, and he interprets them by themselves, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." He avails himself of the guidance, though he does not defer to the authority, of primitive antiquity. The authority to which he *does* defer is that of the Anglican Church; and in thus applying a standard accessible to every eye, and—we had thought until we read No. 90—comprehensible by every intellect, we have a much better guarantee for Scriptural orthodoxy than in the authority of what Dr. Hook is pleased to call "primitive antiquity"—but which is only entitled to deference so far as it is consistent with the plain and literal tenor of the word of God!

The last of these pamphlets which has at present reached us—but not the least, if we consider the sonorous appellation of the writer, is a letter to Mr. Newman, from N. Wiseman, D.D., Bishop of Melipotamus—and this affords tolerably convincing evidence of the "convergence" of Mr. Newman and his followers towards the vicious extreme of Popery. Already had Dr. W. congratulated his fellow Romanists in their organ, the *Tablet*, on "the movement towards Catholic ideas and Catholic feelings which some theologians at Oxford a few years back quietly but effectually commenced;" and intimated his conviction that "it was a sacred duty to lend a helping hand" towards the happy consummation of

their return to the bosom of the pseudo-Catholic Church. That hand is here held out in his letter to Mr. Newman, with whom he claims an old acquaintanceship at Rome (*noscitur a socio*), but he does not object to No. 90, which no doubt in his view, as far as it goes, is as "perfectly satisfactory" as Mr. Newman's letter to Dr. Jelf is to the Vicar of Leeds. He comments only upon certain parts of the letter to Dr. Jelf, in which Mr. Newman had endeavoured to dilute, if not to neutralize, the poison of the Tract; and declares, among other strange things, that "he never heard a word that could lead him to suppose that our Blessed Lady and the Saints are, or ought to be, the prominent objects of regard." On this head we might refer him to the Breviary published at Norwich, in the year 1830, extracts from which will be found in our last number, at page 231, and which contains prayers to a variety of saints, in which they are of course the "prominent objects of regard." We might also comment on the singularity of marking the relative importance of theological doctrines by arithmetical proportion. Thus, he tells us, that in the theological course pursued at the Roman College, the subject of the Incarnation occupies 360 pages; the saints and their relics, images, &c. under 100, and that, in another volume, Heaven occupies about 45 pages; "Hell" 53, "Purgatory" 23. From these premises we are to conclude therefore that the doctrine of Saints, &c. is equivalent to one-fourth part of the doctrine of the Incarnation; and that we know just twice as much about heaven as we do about purgatory. We do not mean, however, to meddle with Dr. Wiseman beyond his conclusion—we will not even quote his interesting anecdote of the little theologian at Poestum, who explained the relation between the Madonna and the Saviour so much to the edification of the Protestant gentleman. We terminate our painful task, for the present, with Dr. Wiseman's own episcopal valediction; and we envy not the feelings of Mr. Newman, if he can read it without the apprehension, if not the consciousness, that he has betrayed the dearest interests of the pure Scriptural Church which he was solemnly pledged to defend. "I thank you, Rev. Sir, from my heart, for the welcome information which your letter contains, that men, whom you so highly value, should be opening their eyes to the beauties and perfections of our Church, and require such efforts, as your interpretation of the Articles, to keep them from straggling in the direction of Rome." After this, should Mr. Newman be disposed to abjure the heresies of the Church which is based upon the word of God alone, and return to the bosom of that which falsely usurps the prostituted name of Catholic, we think that he is at least bound in gratitude to seek for absolution at the hands of the Bishop of Melipotamus!

SIX MONTHS WITH THE CHINESE EXPEDITION. By
Lord JOCELYN. London: *Murray*. 1841.

WHATEVER be the final issue of affairs now pending between our own government and that of China, one desirable result may be looked for at all events—we mean the enlargement of our acquaintance with the manners and customs of a people concerning whom we have hitherto been in a state of all but profound ignorance. Let us not be accused of libelling the intelligence of the community. No stronger proof is needed of what we assert, than the simple fact that a gentleman of active and inquiring mind, living too in the very midst of the busiest haunts of commerce and information—the Rev. Mr. Thelwall—did actually publish to the world, some sixteen or eighteen months ago, a volume ycleped “The Iniquities of the Opium Trade,” containing amongst other matters, the following ingenuous confession:—

“‘The iniquities of the opium trade with China?’ Methinks I hear some one exclaim on reading the title of my book: ‘I never heard before that we carried on any such traffic; much less that any iniquities were connected therewith.’ This ignorance ought not to surprise me: *for I was till very recently equally ignorant myself.* But *some weeks ago* my attention was called to the circumstances connected with the traffic in opium, which is continually carried on between the possessions of the East India Company and that vast empire. *The subject was then entirely new to me.*”—(pp. 1, 2.) The italics in this passage are our own.

Who is it that says, “If I want to understand any subject I make it my first business to write a book about it?” Acting, we may presume, upon some such principle, Mr. Thelwall wrote his book about China and the opium trade, the very existence of the latter having been unknown to him “some weeks” previously. We trust that his well-meant endeavours have been rewarded with success, so far at least as to convince him that to every question there are two sides, a fact of which he does not appear to have been thoroughly cognizant, when “The Iniquities of the Opium Trade” first solicited the suffrages of the public.

But we beg pardon of our readers for this digression. We alluded to the case of Mr. Thelwall as strikingly exemplifying *the caliginousness* of the British public in reference to China and Chinese affairs. The book named at the head of the present article may be regarded as an amiable attempt to dispel some little portion of this our darkness. The Author, Lord Jocelyn, is the

son of that excellent nobleman the Earl of Roden, of whom no true member of our Church and loyal subject of our Sovereign can ever speak except in terms of reverence and affection. This is enough of itself to conciliate our goodwill towards him. But his lordship's personal claims to attention will be found by no means inconsiderable. He tells us in his modest preface that his "sketch is entirely taken from private notes, and recollections of conversations held at different times with residents in the country, or with men interested in its affairs." Again he says—"the following sketch was written on the voyage from Canton to Bombay, when the scenes described were fresh in the Author's memory." These are just the circumstances which stamp a value on his little volume. A laboured disquisition upon the political aspect of Chinese affairs and the probable nature of our relations hereafter with that extraordinary people, had been alike wearisome to the general reader, and unsuitable to the Author's youth and inexperience. We believe his lordship to have but just attained his twenty-fifth year, and his title-page informs us how brief has been the period of his personal acquaintance with China. We think that under these circumstances he has done well in confining himself almost* exclusively to the narration of what he saw and heard during the short campaign in which he bore a part. We proceed to lay some of the facts which he has brought together before our readers.

The grand *event* of the campaign was, as everybody knows, the capture of Chusan, more correctly, we believe, Tcheou Chan. Everybody, however, does not know the public-spirited and even noble manner in which the Chinese authorities conducted themselves previously to that disastrous affair, (disastrous we think alike to victors and vanquished†) and the courage displayed by them during the attack itself. These are qualities for which most of us had probably been but little inclined to give them credit. Listen to Lord Jocelyn, himself an eye-witness of what he relates :

"In the afternoon of the 4th of July," (the squadron had just anchored in the harbour) "I accompanied Captain Fletcher, commander of her Majesty's ship Wellesley, on board the Chinese Admiral's junk, which we recognised by its more numerous pennons, and three tigers' heads painted on

* The exceptions are so inconsiderable as not to be worth noticing in the text. They are, too, as might be expected, the least valuable portion of the volume.

† We have been kindly permitted to see a letter from a medical gentleman attached to her Majesty's 26th regiment, dated "Chusan, September 15th, 1840." The following is part of the distressing intelligence which it communicates :—

"There are 370 men in the sick list. The whole force is sickly, although the camp is situated on a hill, and exposed to the influence of a strong breeze. But the breeze blows across rice-swamps, which are hotbeds of disease. Before breakfast daily I see and prescribe for 100 patients, and again in the afternoon."

the stern. Our orders were to summon the town and island to surrender within six hours.

"As we shoved alongside the Admiral's junk, they ran their gangway guns out; but before they could make any preparation for resistance (if they had intended it) we jumped on board with our interpreter, and were surrounded by swarms, that seemed to gather from every crevice of the vessel; and when it was seen on shore that we were on board the junk, numbers waded off from the town.

"They showed not the slightest mark of hostility, but received us with great civility, informing us that the Admiral was on shore, with the other great officers of the district; but that they had sent to apprise him of our arrival.

"During the visit they handed round tea. In the course of half an hour the Chumpin (Naval Governor) and suite arrived. He was an old man, and bore in his face the marks of opium; he wore a red button in his cap, and the other officers mounted blue and white.

"We opened the summons, and they read it in our presence, and indeed before the assembled group: the deep groans and increasing pressure of the people warned us that we were amongst a hostile multitude.

"The summons addressed to the people stated that no injury was intended them, but it was against their rulers and their servants we had come to make war for their unjust acts. Of this they seemed perfectly aware; but they hated the invading barbarians more bitterly than their Tartar rulers; and their clenched hands and anxious faces proved to us how false was the idea, that we were come amongst a people who only waited for the standard of the foreigner to throw off a detested and tyrant yoke.

"After some conversation, they agreed to accompany us to the flag-ship, and upon our proposing to remain as hostages on board their junk, they simultaneously refused, and begged we would take a seat in their boat to the Wellesley.

"All was here repeated to them to the same end as what they already knew; and the reason and purport of our present hostile movement on the place was explained. They complained of the hardship of being made answerable for wrongs that we had received at Canton, and said, naturally enough, "those are the people you should make war upon, and not upon us who never injured you. We see your strength, and know that opposition will be madness; but we must perform our duty, if we fall in so doing."—(pp. 49—52.)

Undismayed by the size and strength of a line-of-battle ship (the first in all probability they had ever beheld), and the tremendous batteries which frowned around her decks, these brave men remained deaf to the representations of Sir Gordon Bremer, who "entreated them to consider well" their enemies' force and their own weakness, and left the flag-ship with a resolution to defend their town and island to the utmost. They closed indeed with the Commodore's offer of a suspension of hostilities until the following morning; but this evidently was but to gain time, in order to strengthen, as much as might be, their wretched means of resistance. The spectacle during the intervening hours of darkness must have been a superb one.

"During the whole of that night the shore presented a most beautiful spectacle, the hills around and suburbs appearing a moving mass of varie-

gated light. In China no individual ever moves out at night without these painted lanterns, carrying them in their hands, or on short bamboos. By their help we could perceive that crowds were busy throwing up embankments, and placing gingalls and fresh guns in position."—(p. 53.)

The fate of Chusan, and that of its gallant "naval and military Governor," are thus described:—

"The British men-of-war were lying in line, with their larboard broadsides towards the town, at a distance of two hundred yards from the wharf and foot of the hill. They consisted of the Wellesley, 74; Conway and Alligator, 28; Cruiser and Algerine, 18; and ten gun brigs. At eight o'clock the signal was hoisted to prepare for action; still, however, time was given by the Commodore, hoping to the last they would repent, and it was not until two o'clock that the troops left the transports in the boats of the squadron, and took up their position in two lines in rear of the men-of-war, to land under cover of the fire. At half-past two the Wellesley fired a gun at the martello tower: this was immediately returned by the whole line of junks, and the guns on the causeway and the hill; then the shipping opened their broadsides upon the town, and the crashing of timber, falling" (of) "houses, and groans of men resounded from the shore. The firing lasted on our side for nine minutes, but even after it had ceased a few shots were still heard from the unscathed junks.

"When the smoke cleared away a mass of ruin presented itself to the eye, and on the place lately alive with men none but a few wounded were to be seen; but crowds were visible in the distance flying in all directions. A few were distinguished carrying the wounded from the junks into the town, and our friend the Chumpin was seen borne from his vessel by a faithful few, having lost his leg in the action by a round shot. It is as well here to mention, that he was taken to Ningpo, a town on the opposite island; and although honours were heaped upon him for his gallant but unavailing defence, he survived but a few days to wear them.

"Before the last shot was fired, the General and his staff left the Wellesley. We landed on a deserted beach, a few dead bodies, bows and arrows, broken spears and guns, remaining the sole occupants of the field."—(pp. 55—57.)

From a scene of misery and bloodshed let us turn to one of a very different description. The following account of the city of Tinghai cannot fail to interest the reader, and will afford at the same time a favourable specimen of our Author's manner:—

"The city lies embosomed in luxuriant paddy, except towards the rear, where a beautiful hill commands the whole town, dotted with clumps of fine trees, part of it being included within the wall and the fortifications that encircle the town.

"Tinghai is surrounded by a wall, about sixteen feet in thickness and twenty in height. There are four gates, agreeing with the cardinal points of the compass, traversed much in the form of Mahrattah forts, the principal one being on the southern point facing the sea. The wall is surrounded by a canal, which acts as a ditch to the fortification, except at the north-west angle. The streets are narrow, and many of the houses dry-rubbed, and polished outside; but the roofs are the most picturesque part of the buildings. Many of the respectable houses have pretty gardens attached to them, with a high wall shutting them out entirely from the town.

"The interiors of some of the houses were found beautifully furnished and carved. One that is now inhabited by the Governor, and believed to have been the property of a literary character, was, when first opened, the

wonder and admiration of all. The different apartments open round the centre court, which is neatly tiled; the doors, window-frames, and pillars that support the pent-roof, are carved in the most chaste and delicate style, and the interior of the ceiling and wainscot are lined with fret-work, which it must have required the greatest nicety and care to have executed. The furniture was in the same keeping, denoting a degree of taste the Chinese have not in general credit for with us. The bed-places in the sleeping apartments of the ladies were large dormitories, for they can hardly be called beds. At one corner of the room is a separate chamber, about eight feet square, and the same in height; the exterior of this is usually painted red, carved, and gilt; the entrance is through a circular aperture, three feet in diameter, with sliding panels; in the interior is a couch of large proportions, covered with a soft mat and thick curtains of mandarin silk: the inside of the bed is polished and painted, and a little chair and table are the remaining furniture of this extraordinary dormitory.

"Many of the public buildings excited great astonishment among those who fancied they were in a half barbarous country. Their public arsenals were found stocked with weapons of every description, placed with the greatest neatness and regularity in their different compartments. The clothes for the soldiers were likewise ticketed, labelled, and packed in large presses; and the arrows, which from their size and strength drew particular attention, were carefully and separately arranged. To each arsenal is attached a fire-engine, similar to those used in our own country."—(pp. 63—66.)

Whilst engaged in an expedition which his military duties required him to make into the interior of the country, Lord Jocelyn was much struck with the romantic character of the surrounding scenery. We quote a passage which displays considerable graphic power:—

"After traversing for some miles a luxuriant sea of paddy-fields, the way wound up the side of the mountains, through a lonely pass. The path here was cut into easy flights of steps; and these passages, which are numerous through the whole island, are all formed in the same manner.

"The surrounding hills were covered with the tea-plant, cotton, dwarf oak, and a species of arbutus, rich with its red fruits; whilst their lofty summits towered on high, clad in the bright green pasture. The long valleys seen from the ascent stretched from the mouths of the different ravines, some lost in the many windings in the hills, whilst others again swept down to the sea-shore, laden with their luxuriant crops of rice, bending to the morning breeze; and far away over the curious buildings of Tinghai, the British fleet lay anchored on the sleeping water. Here and there, as if dropped at random upon the sides of the hills, were clumps of fine trees; and peeping through their thick foliage, the roofs of houses and temples diversified the scene. Amongst many of the beautiful groves of trees which here invite the wanderer to repose, spots are selected as the resting-places of mortality; and gazing on these tranquil scenes, where the sweet clematis and fragrant flowers help to decorate the last home of man, the most careless eye cannot fail to mark the beauties of the grave."—(pp. 80, 81.)

In most cases our countrymen appear to have been tolerably successful in conciliating the good-will of the *Chusanese*, when once they had broken through the (it must be confessed not very surprising) prejudice, that their visitors were no better than "bloody-minded barbarians." Instances, however, were not wanting in which terror proved a more potent counsellor than

reason. The scene described in the following passage must have had much of comic effect, but for its tragical termination :—

“ As I walked, one evening during this period, from a temple where I had been on duty with the Adjutant-General, my path lay alongside a tank, on the border of which a sentry was posted to protect the magistrate's office. He had under his charge a Chinese prisoner seized for some slight offence. Having passed on to the office, I remarked, on my return in an hour's time, the same sentry looking anxiously in the water, and his charge missing. Casting my eyes in the same direction, I saw a man's head and long tail floating in the tank, which was scarcely knee-deep. The prisoner must have been so terrified at the ordeal to be undergone, that he sprung from the sentry's charge into the water; and he, not conceiving, to use his own expression, that the man would or could drown himself in a puddle, left him there to cool. So determined and frightened, however, at the new barbarian law-givers had the poor man been, that he must have held his head under the water till life was totally extinct, for when taken out, although medical aid was immediately procured, not the slightest symptom of animation was apparent.”—(pp. 75, 76.)

On the 30th of August was held that memorable conference with “the High Mandarin Keashen,” member of the imperial cabinet, from the date of which the tide, hitherto setting in favour of the expedition, began, as is now pretty evident, to turn against it. The truth seems to be that we are no match for the Chinese in diplomacy :

“ Si disparibus bellum incidat —
—— discedat pigrior.”

In the field the case is different ; but what of the largest triumphs there,

“ If policy regains what arms had lost?”

The issue of the Chinese quarrel now that we are in the hands of Commissioners a thousand miles from the capital—our troops moreover ill-fed and worse lodged, and dying of fever amid the paddy-swamps of Chusan,* is more than the wisest of us dare venture to predict. But we are forgetting Lord Jocelyn. In the following passage we have some account of Keashen, and the conference between that great man and Captain Elliot :—

“ In an hour we reached the landing-place. A bridge of boats had been constructed for our use across the mud-flat, and a narrow pathway, leading some hundred yards from the shore, brought us to an encampment, which had been thrown up for the reception of the mission.

“ A blue screen was placed at the entrance, so as to hide the interior from the gaze of the public, and here we were met by many more mandarins, and marshalled into the presence of Keashen. He rose at our entrance, and received the mission with great courtesy and civility. Indeed, the manners of these high mandarins would have done honour to any courtier in the most polished court of Europe. He begged us to remain covered, and was intro-

* See note at page 262.

duced to each person separately, and expressed his hopes that the supplies had been received by the squadron. He made some excuse for our reception in the tents, but intimated that Tarkou was some distance from the landing-place.

"Judging from appearance, he might have been a man of forty, and looked, what he is said to be by his countrymen, a person of great ability. He was dressed in a blue silk robe, with a worked girdle; on his legs were the white satin boots common to all the higher orders; his head was covered with a mandarin summer cap, made of fine straw; in it was placed the deep red coral button, denoting the rank of the wearer, and the peacock's feather drooping between the shoulders.

"The encampment was surrounded with a high canvass wall, resembling that which encircles the private apartments of great men and native rajahs when travelling through India. Inside this screen were eight small tents, in each of which a table and forms were placed. These formed an oval, and in the centre was erected a canvass cottage, of rather an ingenious description; whilst at the upper end, concealed by another screen, stood the tent of conference. This was lined with yellow silk (the royal colour), and worked with the arms of the empire at the back.

"The interpreters and Captain Elliot remained with the commission whilst the rest of the officers and gentlemen sought the different tents around, in which the lower orders of mandarins were busy preparing a breakfast for the party, for it was an extraordinary thing in this visit, that everything was apparently done by mandarins, none of their servants being admitted."

Not at all extraordinary, my Lord Jocelyn, if you consider how important it was that the mandarins should be able to tell just what story they pleased, without encountering a single incredulous look, as soon as yourself and brethren had been got out of the way.

"After a conference of six hours, during which period the loud voices of the plenipotentiaries in high argument had often struck upon our ears, the British plenipotentiary came forth, and the rest of the party having performed their salaams to the Chinese Commissioner, we departed for the Wellesley, greatly, I believe, to the relief and satisfaction of the mandarins.

"The result of the conference requiring additional time to be given for another answer to arrive from the court, the squadron again got under weigh, to sail and make discoveries in this sea, hitherto so little known to the English mariner."—(pp. 110—112, 115, 117.)

On the whole, we are well pleased with the little journal from which we have endeavoured to extract information and amusement for our readers. It is the modest, plain, straight-forward narrative of a soldier and an honest man—we hate the phrase "a man of honour." Our chief regret in laying it down has been, that the Noble Author did not see more, that so he might have told us more. We must not, however, take leave of him without expressing our regret at finding, in the 43rd page, a sneer at that zealous, self-denying missionary and man of God, Mr. Gutzlaff. Mr. Gutzlaff ill deserves such treatment, least of all at the hands of a young man.

We hope that this blot may be effaced, should the book reach a second edition.

We suggest also the omission or correction of such incongruous

phraseology as the following :—" That storm has at last burst forth into the present *attitude of defiance*."—p. 2. "*Systematic darkness inculcated*."—p. 3. "They see faintly glimmering in the distance, *the internal struggle, &c.*"—p. 138. Rhetorical figures are sharp tools, and apt to cut the fingers of the inexperienced or the unwary.

The opium question, and the quarrel with China growing out of it, are matters of very grave importance, and beset, we are willing to admit, with many and great difficulties. Perhaps, however, by endeavouring simply to follow the guidance of common sense and honesty we may not altogether fail if we attempt to place them in a just point of view.

There are three distinct parties, each of whom is concerned in the origin and settlement of the dispute with China—the Chinese themselves—the British government—and the opium-dealers. Nor must we forget a fourth party, who although occupying no portion of "the foreground" fill up the whole "distance" in the piece—we mean the East India Company. Now with regard to the two last-named, the Honourable Company and the opium-traders, we wish we could perceive how it is possible to avoid classing them in the very same category, as enormous offenders against God and man. In the most fertile provinces of India the drug is grown. These are partly British territory, and partly territory under British influence and control. The company possesses within its own dominions a monopoly of the poison-crop ; from that portion of it which is raised in the dependent district of Malwa, it derives a large revenue in the shape of a transit duty. The opium is collected by officers in the service of the company from the immediate cultivators—the Ryots. By the servants of the company it is packed in chests, stamped with the company's proper mark, and in the name and by the authority of the company sold to the opium-traders. To establish if possible still more completely the fact of the East India Company's connection with this vile traffic, it may be added, that it has had samples made up in separate packages, varying in form or quality, and sent to China, in order to ascertain the best mode of suiting its goods to the Chinese market, so as to meet with the readiest and quickest sale.

The traders in opium with China have made themselves obnoxious to two distinct charges, either of which is sufficient utterly to overwhelm them with guilt and shame. In the first place their business, like that of gin-sellers in England, is of so atrocious a nature that it flourishes in exact proportion to the increase of crime and wretchedness amongst their customers ; and secondly, they pursue

their iniquitous calling in contempt and defiance of the laws of the country, an aggravation of guilt which does not lie at the door of the gin-seller. Whatever special pleading, whatever refinement of casuistry, hired or interested advocates may have recourse to in their defence—whatever attempts may be made to extenuate or soften the severity of these charges, their substantial truth is too manifest to need that we should waste a single moment in proving them.

We come next to speak of the government and magistrates of China. That it is lawful for the former to make what regulations it may judge expedient with regard to the admission into the country, or exclusion from the country, of commodities coming from abroad, we presume our readers will one and all admit: That it is the duty of the latter to enforce the regulations of their superiors is equally undeniable. We inquire not concerning the policy of such measures. That is a question with which, in the present argument, we have no concern. We simply affirm the fact of their lawfulness, which, of course, involves their binding obligation alike upon natives, and foreigners trading with the natives. Had then the Chinese acted, as they had an undoubted right to act in the case before us, the legislative authority passing laws against the opium-trade, and subordinate powers enforcing their observance, seizing, if needful "*vi et armis*," the goods of smugglers, and visiting them personally with the punishment which they deserved, there had been nothing more to be said on the subject. But here comes the nodus of the question. The government of China, that is the emperor and his council, issued indeed from time to time prohibitory decrees against the trade in opium; but the magistrates, those to whom the enforcement of the decrees was committed, not only neglected their duty, during a long course of years, but shamefully engaged in the trade themselves, or basely accepted bribes from those who were engaged in it. It is quite impossible to believe that this was unknown to the emperor at Pekin—scarcely possible to believe that it was done without his connivance, or that of the members of his cabinet. Under these circumstances does it not become exceedingly questionable how far the High Commissioner Lin had a right to demand the surrender of chests of opium, to the number of twenty thousand and upwards, even although it be admitted (some have denied it) that they were at the time within the limits of his jurisdiction? The traders had received every encouragement to believe, and to act upon the belief, that there was no serious intention on the part of the government to molest them in their calling, however contrary that might be to the letter of the law. They had had full proof of the supineness,

to say the least, of the court, and the corruption and malefactions of the provincial functionaries at Canton. How then, again we ask, can the Commissioner be justified in resorting, (without any *sufficient** warning) to the extreme measure which marked the commencement of his dictatorship? But when it is further considered, that to enforce this act of arbitrary authority he maltreated, in various ways, our fellow-countrymen, and subjected the representative of our sovereign (who not only had no connection with opium smugglers but actually exerted his whole influence against them) to insult, imprisonment, and threats of starvation, nay of a still more ignominious death,—his violence rises into the dignity of a grave national offence, and assuredly calls for the interference of a power which the Chinese have been but too long permitted to treat with contempt.

On this ground it is that we venture to justify the present naval and military expedition to China. How far we have a right to insist on indemnification for the opium surrendered to the Imperial Commissioner, we candidly confess that, with the imperfect data before us, we are at a loss to decide. We must leave this point to be settled by wiser and better-informed heads than our own. But on the score of wrongs inflicted, many and grievous, both previous to and since the opium seizure, we have a long account against China. As men bound to promote peace and to forgive those who have injured us, we might be willing that “by-gones should be by-gones,” but it is our clear and manifest duty to take measures that the things of which we justly complain should exist no longer. If we are to have commercial intercourse with the Celestial Empire hereafter, it must be on a footing of avowed and recognised equality—no more Hong Merchants to act as convenient go-betweens, to preserve the dignity of viceroys and commissioners from official contact with “outside barbarians”—no more confinement within the narrow walls of a factory on the shores of the Canton river, from which the wives and daughters of our merchants are excluded—no more gross and to the last degree insulting proclamations posted upon the dwellings of men of probity and virtue—no more encouragement to little rascally ragamuffins to mob them if they venture an hundred yards from their own doors, shouting after them—“Foreign devils—barbarians—red-bristled devils—lie-telling devils”—often adding obscene expressions and flinging light missiles.”† All these and such like things must come to an end from henceforth, and it is the duty of the British government to demand and insist that they shall.

* In his first proclamation Lin required the surrender of all the opium in the ports or on the coast of China.

† Travels in China, by Howard Malcolm, 1837.

With the opium traders we have no sympathy and can have none. If we have said any thing to imply that they have some show of right to compensation for the loss they have sustained, it was because justice required that we should condemn the premature violence of others almost or altogether as guilty as themselves. Their case is, that their accomplices have laid violent hands on their share of an ill-gotten booty, or on the means at least of procuring such a booty. On this ground there is perhaps something to be said for them, but on no other ground than this. Themselves and their calling we hold in utter abhorrence. If it should hereafter appear, that the leaders of the present expedition to China have made use of the power with which they are armed to open fresh doors to the opium traffic, or to re-open those which have been closed, we trust that their doings will be promptly disavowed and redressed by authorities at home. Should those authorities be reluctant—or slow—to act, then we confidently believe that the indignant voice of the British people will be raised against the perpetration of a national crime—that it will speak a language too plain to be misunderstood—too firm and bold to be despised.

. The foregoing pages were written before the arrival of the late intelligence from Canton. After a careful consideration of the treaty initiated (not concluded) by Captain Elliot with the Chinese ministers, we see no reason to omit or modify a single expression that we have employed. Every one of the articles of this treaty is liable to serious objection—none more so than the first, in the opening sentence of which a certain portion of the Chinese territory is made over in sovereignty to the Queen of England, which in the succeeding sentence is virtually resumed. Then upon the opium question—the “*causa teterrima belli*,” not one word is said. That fatal bone of contention remains a bone of contention still, and may at any given period provoke a new series of insults and injuries from the Chinese, and another expedition to avenge them on the part of Britain. That the “*celestials*” are as determined as ever to soar far above the heads of ordinary mortals is ludicrously apparent from an order, or some such thing, of Keashen’s, issued just after his recent drubbing.

“Keashen, a great minister of state,” and we know not how many fine things besides, “writes this,” &c. “The English barbarians are now *obedient to orders*—invoking me with the most earnest importunity that I should for them report, and *beg for the Imperial favour*,” &c.

John Chinaman is assuredly resolved to be John Chinaman, and

nothing but John Chinaman, to the end of the chapter. The commander of the fleet of "celestial" war-junks sends his flag of truce, when he would have a parley with the enemy, in a boat rowed by *a single old woman*. Hostilities suspended, from sheer pity to an almost defenceless population, the redoubted Keashen forthwith comes out with the flourish we have just seen. There is a story about Buonaparte exclaiming, on some occasion when he chanced upon unpleasant collision with the English—"These English—they positively don't know when they are beaten." What would Buonaparte have said, had he had to do with the Chinese?

CHARLES LEVER; *or, the Man of the Nineteenth Century*.

By the Rev. W. GRESLEY, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield.
London: *Burns*. 1841.

THIS is a short tale, very neatly embellished, and simple in its style, but with no great pretensions to originality or inventive power. The Author's object seems to be twofold. First, he seeks to expose the evil nature of Socialism, Chartism, causeless separation, and other social maladies that afflict our country. In the second place, he would impress on his readers the tendency of evangelical preaching to generate schism and still worse evils, unless counteracted by a strong infusion of what he terms "sound Church Principles."

On the first topic we entirely agree with Mr. Gresley, and find many sentiments which we cordially adopt as our own. Such are the following paragraphs, which the upper classes in our country would do well to lay to heart. After a sketch of our internal state, he proceeds:—

"When people think on this dreadful state of things, which from time to time is forced upon their notice, they are wont to exclaim, with a mixed feeling of dread and aversion, against the fearful turbulence and immorality of the lower classes. They seldom consider that it is impossible that one class should have become so deeply corrupted, without the gross negligence—nay, without the direct co-operation—of those above them. It is in the higher classes that we must trace the source; and it is there also, humanly speaking, that we must find the remedy of the evil.

"The root of the mischief is an evil heart of unbelief, exhibiting itself in a manner peculiar to the age. It is not seen—at least amongst the upper classes—in a bold avowal of infidelity, nor in an eager prosecution of error; but rather in a disregard of truth, an indifference to truth or falsehood, a prostration of the soul to carnal pleasures and mere worldly business, engendering an utter carelessness as to the eternal distinction between right and

wrong. You shall see many men in all classes—in the higher they are more conspicuous, but they abound equally in all—men who look with a supercilious eye of pity on those few who are still zealous for the truth. If they regard the various opinions of men at all, it is not to discover which is in the right, but to wonder at their contentions. They affect to be spectators only, forgetting that they are themselves actors, who have a part to play; beings placed on the earth that they may live to the glory of God who made them, and be the instruments of spreading the knowledge of His truth; responsible creatures, who will one day have to give a strict account of all that has been committed to them. But, strange to say, they look calmly on, and either amuse themselves with the eagerness of others, or blame them for needlessly ruffling the calm surface of pleasurable enjoyment. They bless God that they are not bigots, forgetting that infidelity or scepticism is a far worse state of mind than bigotry. Admitting in words that revealed religion is true, they profess to care for neither Church nor sect; they forget that, if God has revealed any thing at all, *there must be one right way of receiving that revelation*, and that all other ways must of necessity be wrong. It is not that these men could not, if they chose, make up their minds as to what is truth; but from sheer indifference they seem not to think it worth their while to take any trouble about it, either as regards themselves or others. A favourite expression with them is, that ‘religion is an affair between man and his Maker;’ that it matters not to us what are a man’s religious opinions. Churchman, Dissenter, Jew or Mahometan, Infidel or Atheist, all are to be treated by us on the same equal terms. The pleasant intercourse of life is not to be disturbed, as these Gallios think, by foolish questions of mere names and words. Charity and good will—that is to say, an indifference to all religious truth—is the true maxim of the world. Thus they speak; and the result of their principles may be seen in the errors and confusion of a divided nation, and its unsettled government and laws.”—(pp. 229—231.)

“That which is at the present time above all things necessary, is to endeavour to establish in men’s minds a feeling that *truth is something real and discoverable*. We believe that God has given us a revelation from heaven (for I speak to the latitudinarian, not the infidel); we believe that God’s word is truth. Well, then, if God has given us a revelation of His will, it is absurd, surely, to suppose that there is no way of ascertaining the true sense of that revelation. The various sects and societies, opposed as they are to each other, cannot all be right; and those which are wrong are the adversaries of God’s truth, and therefore to be avoided and discountenanced. Moreover, the truth demands, for its own sake, the support and adherence of understanding men; it demands that we should both live according to it and promulgate it. To disregard it, or to obscure it, or to refuse to aid in its propagation, is a sort of irreverence and ingratitude towards God, of which men will surely have to give account.”—(p. 232.)

We agree fully in deploring the wide extent and fearful danger of this heartless, latitudinarian form of infidelity in these last lines. But we are not sure that our Author’s remedies are such as we could fully approve, or as would effectually stem the current of evil. What “holy rites and ceremonies have fallen into disuse through lapse of years” we are at a loss to divine, unless it be lighted candles on the “altar” at noonday, or wreaths of spring flowers in our churches; and if we were “scrupulously to restore” them, we fear they would not act as a charm to drive away the plague-spots from our land. Mr. Gresley, like some writers, more deeply imbued than himself with Tractarian views, has a keen

sense of existing evils, but, like them, a degree of childishness mingles with his suggested remedies. After the earth has groaned for eighteen centuries under the guilt of a rejected gospel, we despair of fascinating Leviathan by neat woodcuts of stone fonts and Gothic aisles, or of leading him captive by festoons of flowers round our pulpits and "altars:" nor have we more faith in the mimic mockery of wax tapers glimmering at mid-day. No, it is only the glorious light of atoning love—that truth which some would have us reserve under a bushel—that can exorcise the mighty spirit of evil, and reclaim the wanderers to their Church, or the nation to its God.

The tone of statement upon the second point we regard with much more suspicion. That it is the duty of a clergyman, not only to proclaim the great truths of the gospel, but also to cultivate in his people a grateful and affectionate attachment to the visible Church of which they are members,—this we freely grant, and firmly believe. The neglect of this duty may lead, and, we doubt not, has led, to serious evils. But the opposite danger is still more general and more appalling; when Christ's own appointed ministers hide the gospel itself in a cold and heartless reserve, or pervert it into "another gospel"—a doctrine of forms, and rubrics, and rites, and ceremonies, and self-righteous observances, that would draw down a curse even upon an angel from heaven. Of this danger, though far greater than the other, our Author gives no alarm. His little tale seems indeed rather likely to increase it, and we shall therefore spend a few words upon its opening chapters.

The narrator is a rector from the south of England, who describes himself as paying a visit by railroad to an old friend in the north, Mr. Morton, the rector of the little town of Laxington. There, at morning prayers in the church, he meets our hero, Charles Lever, and inquires into his history, which forms the substance of the tale. The two previous clergymen had been evangelical preachers, the first able as well as zealous, the second pious, but dull. Lever's parents then fell off to the Dissenters; their son grows up in the midst of liberals—turns Freethinker, Socialist, and Chartist—takes part in a Chartist insurrection—is wounded all but mortally—and at last, by the spiritual counsel of Mr. Morton, restored to the Church. The tale is then wound up by some general reflections.

The views of our two rectors are first brought before us in these words:—"We had not arrived at the age which views improvement with suspicion, and is unable to enter into the restorative course upon which the Church has now set herself in earnest."

This opening sentence is curious enough in a professed reviver of authority and primitive usage. It seems rather parallel with the lectures given by Drs. Hook and Molesworth to their own diocesans, about their lax and low views of the episcopal office. Is it the primitive and apostolic practice for juniors to hint to their elders in the ministry, that they are too old to improve? If so, perhaps it would be better in this new restoration of the Church, if the three orders were to be reversed, and deacons were to take precedence of *presbyters*, as well as presbyters of bishops. But we do not know precisely what the restoration itself is which our Author commends. There has been a triple restoration in the last fifty or seventy years. First, the doctrines of our reformed Church, which had been neglected or disowned, have been restored, in the preaching of numbers of the clergy, with something of their power and fulness. Next, the outward functions of the Church, at home and abroad, have been partly resumed, in missionary labours, the building of fresh churches, the supply of active and zealous clergy, and the efforts to extend church education. Thirdly, we have had a restoration, by some few within her pale, of doctrines and practices that look strongly towards Rome—the sinless perfection of the Virgin, atonement for sin by Jesus *and* fasting, penance the second plank after shipwreck, idolatrous selections from the Breviary, and lamentations over our own Communion-service as a judgment from God, the duty of keeping back from the people the atonement of our blessed Lord, and of urging on them the exclusive apostolic succession of the Romish and Anglican clergy. These are some broad features of the third restoration, which, just so far as it spreads, frustrates both the others; which turns the preaching of the gospel into the preaching of clerical pride, and would make church education an engine for riveting a yoke of superstitious bondage upon the freemen of the Lord.

Some features of the course of improvement at Laxington church are then given. “The greatest of all was the removal of a cumbrous and gaudy pulpit, which had quite obstructed the chancel. The pulpit, in a more modest shape, was now placed against a side column, so that the eye rested upon the holy altar, having a rich covering of crimson velvet, a massive Bible and Prayer Book, and the whole surmounted by a simple cross (not a crucifix, observe, good reader: a crucifix is an image, and Basil Morton was as great a foe to Romish abuses as to Puritan slovenliness, and considered the ‘bowing down’ to a crucifix a direct infringement of the second commandment, or certainly too much like it to be safe).”

With regard to this instructive passage—this title of “altar,” so dearly cherished, though without warrant from either “the massive Bible or the Prayer Book”—this great merit in thrusting the pulpit to one side, as if preaching, the main work and office of God’s incarnate Son during his life on earth, were quite a secondary thing; this “image” of our Saviour’s cross, so nicely discriminated from the crucifix, and this charge of slovenliness where the more innocent image is wanting—we shall only say, that if they are not Romish abuses, they are at least “too much like them to be quite safe.” Nor is it a very just ground for commending the rector, that he “induced his parishioners to take a pride in their place of worship, and endeavour to make it more worthy of Him whose it was.” Our Author’s meaning, supposing it to be sound, could not be more unhappily worded. The history of St. Stephen and of the Jewish temple should have taught him that pride is never more dangerous to man, or more offensive to God, than when its object is a place of divine worship. We have next the state of things described under Mr. Wilson, the first of Mr. Morton’s two predecessors.

“His attendance to his parishioners was most constant. A flourishing school rose up under his auspices. A Bible society and missionary society were established through his exertions. The church was crowded on the Lord’s day; and as to his sermons, all acknowledged them to be excellent—so searching, so subduing, so edifying, so charming. Mr. Wilson had only one great failing, and that was a grievous one, though quite unperceived by himself or his congregation—he was *unsound in Church principles*; rather, he entirely omitted Church principles from his scheme of gospel truth. He could thread the mazy path of evangelical doctrine in a sermon taken from the Epistles. He could bring the fire of prophetic denunciation to bear on the sinner’s heart. But he never dwelt on the other part of the divine system—the efficacy of the sacraments—the scriptural doctrine of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and the duties and privileges of its members, which are so simply detailed in the Acts of the Apostles, and illustrated throughout the Epistles. The Bible, and the Bible alone (as he would often state), was the religion of Protestants. But he never considered—what one would think was too evident to escape observation—that many sects of Protestants, taking, as they suppose, the Bible for their guide, but *mistaking their own private opinion for the meaning of the Bible*, have fallen into worse errors than the Romanists, even “denying the Lord who bought them.” Mr. Wilson’s grand fault was, that he knew nothing of the Church as “the pillar and ground of the truth.” God, in his great mercy, has given us both the Bible and the Church; and so long as we keep to both we are safe. But if, like the Romanist, we hear the Church without hearing or reading the Bible; or, like the ultra-Protestant, reject the teaching of the Church, and interpret the Bible according to our own fancy, we are sure to fall into grievous errors.”—(pp. 10, 11.)

This is railroad travelling in theology, and our Hookers, Ushers, and Chillingworths, could they rise from the grave, must be surprised to find how speedily great and difficult questions are settled in the present day. We could wish to ask our Author a few

questions, as we are unable to travel quite so fast. Why does he call evangelical truth "a mazy path?" The scriptural account, we are sure, is very different: "The wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein." "The word is very nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart."

In the next place, if all the clergy of the Church had been as faithful and zealous as Mr. Wilson is here described, where would have been the great practical necessity for these "sound Church Principles?" None would then have forsaken the ordinances of the Church but those who hated its doctrines, and to whom therefore those ordinances would have been little better than the services of the Jews, "a savour of death unto death." Indeed the real value of these "Church Principles," so far as true and scriptural, consists mainly in this very point. They form a partial antidote to the disunion and spiritual desolation which are sure to be caused by the preaching of falsehood, and an unfaithful clergy. What could be more monstrous than for any body of Christ's ministers, by their own dry, barren, heartless formalism, to repel from the Church the people of Christ, who are hungering for the living bread of heaven, and then to throw the blame of this desertion on their predecessors, who may have awakened the spiritual appetite, and faithfully proclaimed the gospel of their Lord?

The successor of Mr. Wilson is next introduced, and the church of course thins rapidly. "It must be confessed, the simple and solemn liturgy was more devoutly joined in than when the church was the scene of such excitement." Our own experience is not, perhaps, very wide; but certainly we have never found the fervour of a congregation's prayers to increase in proportion to the dulness and lameness of the sermons. It seems the aim of some violent declaimers against schism in our day, to create the worst of all schisms, between God's own ordinances, as if to disparage preaching were the way to exalt the liturgy, and to displace the pulpit the only method of restoring due honour to what they call "the sacrament of the altar." Our conviction is the exact reverse. We believe there is a close and intimate union among all the ordinances of God's house. The fervent prayers of a devout congregation are the best help of the preacher in the fulfilment of his high office as God's ambassador; and sound doctrine, preached with earnestness and power, has always proved the main quickener of true devotion.

Our tale then proceeds as follows:—

"Besides the inordinate love of preaching, Mr. Wilson had left as a legacy to his successor several other practices, which all tended to the same result,

of rendering the congregation insensible to the true principles and discipline of the Church. Indeed, he seemed studiously to have endeavoured to do all in his power to obliterate from people's minds all notions of established order. For, whereas the Church regards the Wednesday and Friday of each week with especial reverence—the one as being the day of the betrayal, and the other as the crucifixion of our Lord—Mr. Wilson, quite unconscious of any difference, fixed on Thursday for the assembling of the more serious of his flock. The place chosen for their meeting was the school-house, although the church was not a hundred yards distant; and instead of our beautiful and time-honoured liturgy, he used an extemporary prayer of his own, and then he boasted that the Dissenters attended his lectures!"—(p. 15.)

In this paragraph we have a comprehensive indictment against the evangelical clergy. Their first offence is "an inordinate love of preaching." But the question recurs, who are to be the judges of the due proportion? Are we to take as our infallible guides the writers who have lately proposed to pare down God's ordinance to an occasional twenty minutes' discourse, doled out once a month? Or shall the great Apostle be our standard, who declares, "Christ sent me, not to baptize, but to preach the gospel;" who gives the charge to his successor, "Preach the word—be instant in season and out of season;" and whose only notice bearing on the enormity of a Thursday lecture, to the neglect of holier week-days, is contained in the short warning, "*Ye observe days and months, and times and years; I am afraid lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain?*" Let this great Apostle be the judge, and we have no doubt against whom the verdict would be given—our Author himself, or those whom he here accuses. Nor is it at all clear to us, on the strictest Church principles, why the treachery of Judas should have more power to make a week-day holy, than the appointment of a divine sacrament, and the glorious ascension of our Lord.

But waving the tale itself, and the thickset inuendos which abound in its early chapters, let us briefly examine the main question really at stake. Let us inquire whether evangelical preaching, or that system of pseudo-Catholic rites, forms, and observances, by which some would replace it, is best adapted to build up the Church of Christ, or foster a deep, hearty, and intelligent attachment to that pure and reformed part of it established within this realm.

What, then, is the Church itself, to which we would secure the affections of the people? In its first and highest view, it is the mystical "body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Next, it is the congregation of faithful men—the fellowship here below of redeemed and ransomed souls, united in Christian love, and preparing for heavenly glory. Thirdly, it is a system of Divine ordinances, instituted for the great end of converting sin-

ners to Christ, and preparing their souls by a spiritual training for that kingdom which cannot be moved. These three aspects of the Church give rise, then, to three distinct inquiries.

First, is evangelical preaching, or its proposed substitute, the more likely to attach men to the Church in its highest character, as the body of Christ? The one distinctive feature of such preaching, when it deserves the name, is the prominence which it gives to Christ in all its ministrations. It seeks ever to echo the appeal of the Baptist: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." It suffers the eye of the sinner to rest on no lower object than the eternal Son of God, the Lord of Glory; wounded for his transgressions, and raised again for his justification.

On the other hand, the Anglo-Catholic school, as they term themselves, are busied chiefly with the place of the pulpit, securing a full view of the stone altar, nice distinctions between the lawfulness of the cross and the crucifix, the superior sanctity of Wednesdays and Fridays, and, in short, the revival of old ceremonies, which "entered the Church by indiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge; and because they were winked at in the beginning, grew daily to more abuses, and have much blinded the people and obscured the glory of God."

If, therefore, it be the highest title and glory of the Church to be "the body of Christ," it is very clear by which of these two schools a solid attachment to it will be promoted and increased. It is the grievous danger of this system of reserve and ritual, that wherever it prevails Christ is hidden from the eyes of men. The windows of the sanctuary are stained so deeply with ceremonial forms, and so blocked up with crosses, and ornaments, and the images of apostolical fathers, and their apostatizing successors, that the rays of the Sun of Righteousness can scarcely find an entrance to the inner shrine.

But the Church is "a congregation of faithful men." It is designed to be a communion of those who have one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one hope of their calling. Its high purpose is to supply earnestness to its members, even now, of a fellowship that shall never cease, and of spiritual enjoyments that shall last through eternity. Where shall we look for the fulfilment of these characters? Where shall we find the growth of a cordial attachment based on these hopes, and glowing with these truths? Not surely where all the spiritual doctrines are reserved and kept back, and vague, moonlight dreams come in their place, of the inherent efficacy of sacraments, and the inherent power conveyed by episcopal orders, "to make the body and blood of the Lord,"

and then to place them locally in the hands of each communicant, as a sure viaticum of salvation. No, this may give rise to a very strong attachment of a certain kind, like that of the Faquir to his prayers, or of Micah to his teraphim ; but in such attachment the Church of God, in her true character, as a communion of saints, has but little part or share.

And if we turn to the third aspect of the Church, as a system of divine ordinances for quickening the souls of men, and preparing them for a future and heavenly kingdom, we think the superiority of evangelical preaching above its opposite, the school of mute ceremonies, is scarcely less apparent. Who are most likely to cling with a deep and strong affection to the liturgy, the sacraments, the festivals and ordinances of our Church ; to honour its clergy, and bless God for its establishment in our land ? Surely those who are taught to love its doctrines, to imbibe their spirit, to experience their inward power ; who have felt the worth of the gospel as the stay and comfort of their soul, and prove the blessing attached to every ordinance of God's house, as a means of spiritual refreshment, and a help in their progress to their eternal home. And where are such characters likely to be formed and to increase, but where the great spiritual doctrines of salvation are set forth with zeal and power ? On the other hand, the opposite scheme is directly adapted to thrust one class of churchmen into dissent, and to lead the great body back again, by gentle steps, to the Church of Rome. Those who have some little discernment between sound and false doctrine, or at least between husks and food, and have only a faint sense of the evils of division, and the fulness of the Church ordinances, will be ready to fall into the arms of dissent, and to sacrifice all other advantages, rather than remain under the blight of false teaching, and barren and heartless ministrations. While the great body, content and satisfied with a religion of forms, will think it "more safe" to adopt the complete and compacted system of Rome, than one which by its own promoters is confessed to be maimed and imperfect.

It is true that those who have been accustomed to the sound of the gospel, without any sense of its worth ; whose intellects have been sharpened, without their hearts being improved, are always liable to fall away into any error or delusion. But this cannot justly be made a charge against those who publish the great doctrines of the cross, nor could it be remedied by the strongest inculcation of the sin of schism. Where the Church is not prized as a living ordinance of grace, and for the truth's sake, of which it is the appointed pillar, attachment to it on other grounds, what-

ever may be its political uses, approaches very near to the sin of idolatry. The clergyman whose aim is to build up the body of Christ, and not to fortify a self-righteous confederacy, will ever watch against this serious danger. He will know how easy it is to foster a blind and superstitious zeal, the pride of an ignorant churchmanship, the supercilious contempt for others, which is so congenial to the fallen heart; and how hard to raise them to a wise, steady, and affectionate zeal. But he will also feel that a churchmanship of the first kind is as pernicious in its fruits as it is easy to excite, perverting the Church of Christ into a Jewish synagogue; while a true and spiritual zeal in her cause, though slow and tardy in its growth, brings with it lasting union and an eternal blessing.

But we must close our remarks on this little tale. We gladly own that many instructive lessons may be found in its pages; but we fear their benefit is more than balanced by the exaggerated importance which they attach to forms and outward ceremonies, and the painful tone of disparagement, and almost of contempt, with which they treat the first and highest ordinance of the Church—the preaching of the everlasting gospel. Once let the word of truth perish from the lips of Christ's appointed ministers, and neither the compactness of the Church's framework, nor the gorgeousness of her rites, nor the splendour of her ceremonies, nor flowers on every shrine, nor crosses on every altar, will avert the certain and inevitable doom, or stay the mysterious hand that is writing *MENE* and *TEKEL* on the walls of every part of the mystic Babylon.

A LETTER TO THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF RIPON, *on the State of Parties in the Church of England.* By W. F. Hook, D.D., Vicar of Leeds. London: Rivingtons, &c. 1841.

DR. HOOK is very far from being an ordinary sort of person; but his peculiar characteristics, energy and earnestness, have their dangers. To use his own phrase, "the vicious extreme" of energy is impetuous haste, and its result passion and blundering. The present tract has evidently been put forth in warmth and in a hurry; and were it not for the emphasis which seems to be laid upon it, its array of publishers on the title-page, and its extensive announcement by the daily press, we should probably have taken counsel of a generous forbearance, and passed it over in silence.

For, assuredly, the Vicar of Leeds never before "rushed into print" after a fashion so little creditable either to his reasoning powers or his theological competency. The tract is loose and discursive in the highest degree, and our remarks will necessarily follow him in this fault. We shall endeavour, however, to limit them to three points.

I. We have been somewhat astonished at the strange and novel lessons in ethics which are inculcated in the Doctor's pages. As, for example :—

"On the publication of the 90th Tract for the Times, I determined to point out in a pamphlet what I considered to be its errors. But the moment I heard that the writer was to be silenced, not by argument, but by a usurped authority, that moment I determined to renounce my intention—that moment I determined to take my stand with him."—(pp. 5, 6.)

Again :—

"What I maintain on this point is, that, under existing circumstances, we must become party men. We cannot halt between two opinions. We must take our side. Minor differences must be forgotten when our general principles are attacked."—(p. 6.)

"An awful responsibility rests upon our spiritual rulers. Most humbly and most heartily do I pray that to them may be vouchsafed that spirit of wisdom and sound discretion, which may enable them to moderate between parties without declaring themselves for either."—(pp. 12, 13.)

And again :—

"I will only here observe to your Lordship on the importance of maintaining the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in its neutral position."—(p. 15.)

"If the consciences of High Churchmen be violated, and they be compelled to withdraw from the Society, I do not doubt of their being able to form a new Society, more efficient than the old one; but I do dread the introduction of a fresh element of discord among us."—(pp. 15, 16.)

From these passages we learn—

1. That Dr. Hook perceived in "No. 90" certain errors, and errors of no light or trifling description, since they seemed to make it necessary for him, even at the other end of the kingdom, to issue a pamphlet to point out and reprove them. And yet, "the moment he heard" that other persons, not at a distance, but on the spot—not irresponsible, like himself, but having the religious interests of the University in their keeping,—that these persons had done, what he himself had intended to do; "that moment," says Dr. Hook, "I determined to take my stand *with the writer*." Error, when officially reproved, ceased to be error; and what Dr. Hook was on the point of denouncing, he suddenly resolves to defend! Strange! at least, if not worse than strange. We doubt if Dr. Hook, had he taken a few hours more to think of it, would have ventured upon so rash a declaration as this. As to the expression, "the writer was to be silenced, not by argu-

ment, but by a *usurped* authority," we feel assured that Dr. Hook has already regretted it. Mr. Newman was *not* silenced by the Heads of Houses: all that Board did, was to express its disapprobation. But he *was* "silenced," in a measure, by the injunctions of his own diocesan. Will Dr. Hook call this "a *usurped* authority?"

2. In the next place, we are told that every man "must take his side," for that "*principles are attacked.*" And yet, immediately after, a hope is expressed, that the heads of the Church will "moderate between parties *without declaring themselves for either.*"

In other words, "principles" are to be one thing to Dr. Hook, and another thing to the Bishop of Ripon. It is Dr. Hook's *duty* to take a side; it is the Bishop's duty *not* to take a side.

Can this be true, if "general principles are attacked?" Does not Dr. Hook here betray something of a lurking apprehension, that the Bishops, if induced to declare themselves, would be most likely to declare themselves, as the Bishop of Oxford has already done, *for*, and not *against*, the Articles of the Church. Hence, activity on the part of the friends of "No. 90" is counselled; it is "a duty." But for those who have charge of the Church or the Universities, as, for instance, the Bishops, or the Heads of Houses,—for *them* to say a word is an *usurpation* of authority!

3. But there is another party also, which, in this conflict of principles, is to be "neutral"—the *Christian Knowledge Society*. And a reason is assigned, which is strangely adapted to the end proposed: "If High Churchmen be compelled to withdraw from the Society, *I do not doubt of their being able to form a new Society more efficient than the old one.*"

Why, if so, what prevents their doing it? A new Society *more efficient* than the old one would be a *better* Society. Whoever can ensure this ought to set about the work at once. As to "discord," there need be no discord in the case. Why should not each man be at liberty to do good in the "most efficient" way he can, without any "discord" whatever? If Dr. Hook likes to set up an "High Church" Christian Knowledge Society, we will promise him never to quarrel with him on that account. Just as, if he chooses to let the Pastoral Aid Society alone, he will find that the Pastoral Aid Society will never attempt to attack him.

But we must pass on from the Doctor's *ethics* to

II. The great *discovery* which he has just made. It is communicated to the public in the following terms:—

"We can no longer blind ourselves to the fact, that the Church of England is now a divided body. It cannot be injudicious to say this, when it is evident

to all, that the fact is as I have stated it to be. The most unhappy determination of the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford to censure Mr. Newman—a censure which I have little doubt the Convocation of the University would, if summoned, reverse—has proclaimed this from one end of the country to the other. The meeting of the Pastoral Aid Society in Leeds, which was regarded as a demonstration against me, the vicar of the parish,—a “rally,” as it has been called,—declared it to my parishioners. It would, indeed, be worse than affectation, and a want of moral courage, to deny what is evident to all.”—(pp. 4, 5.)

Since the case of the worthy gentleman, who, at fifty years of age, discovered that he had been talking prose all his life without knowing it,—we have met with nothing so *naive*, nothing so gravely ludicrous, as this. “We can no longer blind ourselves to the fact, that the Church of England is *now* a divided body.” Blind ourselves to the fact!—why is there a student of a year’s standing in any one of our colleges, who does not entirely know, that not only the Church of England, but every other Church that ever existed, or ever will exist this side of the Millennium, has been, is, and must be, “a divided body.” Can Dr. Hook take up the New Testament without finding divisions in all the apostolic churches? Can he open Eusebius, or Socrates, without meeting with the like facts in every page? Does he forget the Jansenists and Jesuits in the Romish communion, or the Gallican and Ultra-montane divisions, or the other thousand-and-one discords which constantly rent that infallible Church? Or, to come down to the Protestant Church of England,—what single period can he point out when the Church of England was *not* a divided body? Beginning with Hooper and Grindal; proceeding to Whitgift and Cartwright; then to Laud and Hall; to Tennison and Tillotson and the Nonjurors: then to Simeon, and Berridge, and Romaine; and coming down to the period when Henry Ryder, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, was publicly assailed by one of his own clergy, *named Walter Farquhar Hook*,—at which moment, from Cranmer’s days down to those of Howley, has the Primate of England presided over any other than a “divided body.” Nor can it, nor ought it to be otherwise, until Bishop Burgess’s thesis, “On the signs of conversion and unconversion in ministers of the Church of England,” shall have become utterly useless and out of date. While those two grand distinctions remain in the Church, it will ever be found, that “*as it was of old, he that is born of the flesh persecuteth him that is born of the Spirit, so it is now.*” To be surprised at such things is mere weakness and folly; to wish for their absence is merely to wish for heaven.

But, lastly and chiefly, we must allude to

III. Dr. Hook’s misrepresentations of the evangelical clergy. True, there is no such phrase in his tract. True, he speaks

always of "the Low Church party;"—but it is abundantly certain that none of those who read him will fail to apply his censures in this direction. For what gave rise to the present tract? Simply an attempt made by Dr. Hook, and suppressed by his Bishop, to introduce, at a meeting of the Christian Knowledge Society, sundry observations on a late meeting of the *Pastoral Aid Society*. His object was, in the speech attempted to be made, and in the tract now printed, to assail the Pastoral Aid Society and its supporters. All who read it will know and feel *this* to be its drift.

Bearing this in mind, let us consider the following passages:—

"The High Church party is accused, by indiscriminating zealots of the Low Church party, of Popery. The Low Church party is accused, by indiscriminating zealots of the High Church party, of Socinianism. And both accusations are false. For we all know, that among those who hold Low Church views, the generality hate Socinianism as cordially as Popery is abominated by the generality of those who hold High Church views. But the accusation on either side would not have been made, or would not have been entertained, unless there was something of truth mixed up in it; and we must admit, that in all principles, as held and applied by fallen man, there is a tendency to a vicious extreme."—(pp. 6, 7.)

"The tendency of Low Churchism is to Socinianism; not that I mean to say that Low Churchmen may not hate Socinianism; but this is the *tendency*. Whenever Low Church principles are extensively prevalent, Socinianism is the result."—(p. 10.)

Now it is too little to say of such a style of assertion as this, that it is *incorrect*. It is a criminal misrepresentation. "Low Churchmen," in Dr. Hook's own meaning, i.e. the supporters of the Pastoral Aid Society, and the evangelical clergy generally, are *not* even "accused by indiscriminating zealots of Socinianism." And as far as possible is it from the truth, that "wherever their principles are extensively prevalent Socinianism is the result."

Dr. Hook would really seem to have been betrayed into this most indefensible assertion by a love of antithesis: for it is a pure fiction. Where are the parties by whom, where are the books in which, so absurd a charge has ever been made, as that evangelical preaching tends to Socinianism?

Dr. Hook cannot be so ignorant as not to know, that of all religious schemes that have any existence, that which stands at the greatest possible distance from Socinianism is the evangelical system. All others may betray a leaning, a lurking kindness, at times; but wherever the doctrines of our Articles and Homilies are preached; wherever the views of Romaine, and Newton, and Simeon are held, there is "*no peace with Socinianism*." The Romanist Archbishop of Dublin may sit down in amicable parley with a Socinian, at the National Education Board at Dublin; and the Protestant Archbishop, after suppressing, as far as he can,

the home missionary preaching of the evangelical clergy, may join the unchristian conclave; but no representative of the evangelical body has ever been seduced into that unholy alliance. The authors of the *Tracts for the Times* may plead for the suppression of the doctrine of the Atonement, and if they could succeed, the Socinian would find little to complain of in the ministry of the Church of England;—but never has any such compromise been even so much as suggested among the evangelical clergy. They fight under the banner inscribed with *Justification by faith in the blood of the Atonement*; and the very sight of those glorious words is worse than a Gorgon's head to the poor Socinian. No, they are *not* charged with a tendency to Socinianism; no one has ever been so foolish as to bring such a charge. Dr. Hook's own imagination has coined the absurdity; but it is returned upon his hands, a fabrication too clumsily executed to pass current.

One other misrepresentation must be noticed, and then we close. The Doctor says:—

“The distinguishing principle of the Low Church party is the assertion of the sufficiency of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture. The High Church party take Holy Scripture for their guide, and in the interpretation of it defer to the authority of primitive antiquity. The Low Church party contend for the sufficiency of private judgment. But if the sufficiency of private judgment be admitted, it follows that there is but one heresy, and that is the rejection of Holy Scripture as the Word of God. Receive the Scriptures, and then, on this principle, you are safe whatever construction you put upon them.”—(p. 10.)

Now this, we must take the liberty of assuring Dr. Hook, is an entire misstatement of the principle asserted and maintained by those against whom he is arguing. And surely he is bound to take their own statement of principles, and not to coin monstrosities, and then father them upon his opponents.

The position taken by those whom he calls “the Low Church party” is no other than that taken by the Church itself, in her Articles and Homilies. It is the supremacy and *sufficiency* of Scripture as the alone rule of faith. We need not here quote the standards of our Church; we are writing for those who know and love them; and they are well aware, that this is the basis on which our Reformers rested everything.

On the other side, says Dr. Hook, “the High Church party take Holy Scripture for their guide, and in the interpretation of it defer to the authority of primitive antiquity.”

Now we will not imitate Dr. Hook, by stating his principle after our own fashion. We take his own statement of it; and from that statement we are enabled to say, that while the Church and “the Low Church party” take SCRIPTURE ALONE as their rule, “the High Church party” take Scripture *and something else*.

This *something else* is the very citadel of Popery. For Popery is only Christianity *and something else*. Every false religion on earth is only a divine tradition, overlaid and ruined by *something else*.

Nor is this qualification, with which Dr. Hook consents to accept God's word, any more reasonable or logical than it is innoxious. It contains in itself the seed of all heresy; but it is, after all, a mere subterfuge.

Here is a book, or rather THE BOOK, the only book which contains the pure and infallible word of God. It is all true—it is all free from error. But then, there are other books, the productions of people called "Fathers," every one of which contains much that is not true, and much that is very weak and silly. They also often contradict both themselves and each other, and frequently leave it a matter of doubt what they really do mean. Now what Dr. Hook and the "High Church party" ask of us is, to consent to take the meaning of the perfect and infallible BOOK, from the imperfect and fallible ones. This is the real point at issue. Truth is to be "interpreted" by error; and that which is wholly and unmingledly the word of God, by that which is the work of poor fallible man.

Now, surely, before we are expected thus to mix sand with our bread, and water (not clean water either) with our wine, we may be allowed to ask the reason why. But none have we ever been able to get, often as we have asked it. It is not said,—it *cannot* be said,—that the Scriptures are dark and obscure, while the works of Origin and Ambrose are clear and lucid. Nor can it be averred, that any one of these "Fathers," or all of them united, had any divine commission to give to the world the true meaning of St. Paul or St. John. No plea, nothing at all resembling a reason, have we ever been able to extract, to prove to us *why* we should take the meaning of the apostles from certain other persons, instead of taking it from *themselves*. All that we ever are treated with is, a tirade against "private judgment," and against the folly of setting up our "interpretations" against the "interpretations" of the early Church.

To which we reply, that the question does not appear to us to be, as to an *interpretation*, but as to *the thing to be interpreted*. Cyprian, and Basil, and Ambrose are placed before us, and we are exhorted to listen to their "interpretations of Scripture." We ask, then, Is it to be conceded to us, that we have reasoning powers sufficiently strong to be able to understand Basil and Ambrose when they speak to us? If this be granted, and if it be fully admitted that we can comprehend the meaning and intent of these

writers,—then we ask, in the next place, what is it that prevents us from understanding, in an equal degree, St. Paul or St. John? If we can *know* what the uninspired and often superstitious and foolish writer says to us, what should prevent us from knowing, with equal clearness, what the inspired and infallible writer tells us? This appears to us to be the turning-point of the argument, and till an answer is given, and a distinction established, we must hold the reference to the Fathers, on the score of “the insufficiency of private judgment,” to be thoroughly and radically illogical.

THE FIVE EMPIRES, *an Outline of Ancient History*. By ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, M.A. *Burns*. 1840.

THERE are few offices more important or more difficult than that of the historian, especially when he records the events of other times than his own. He who writes only the history of his contemporaries relates facts which have passed under his own eye, and has a comparatively easy task to perform; but he who goes back to remote ages, and travels afar to foreign climes, for the materials of his work, requires many and great qualifications to enable him to make it such as shall reflect true honour upon himself, and confer real benefit on others. The first thing to be looked for in an historian is correct and Christian principle; the second is a distinct view of the bearings of events on each other, and upon the great subject of Christianity itself. It is not enough that his head be clear, unless his heart be right; nor will the “honest and good heart” alone constitute him a good historian, without the clear head and keen eye to perceive the true causes and the mutual relations of the incidents which he narrates. The facts of history are but half the battle, without its *rationale*: they are only the body without the spirit.

The author of the work before us proves himself a good historian, by exhibiting both these qualifications. His principles are as Christian as his views are distinct and extensive. His *ground plan* of universal history (so to speak) is admirable; he fits all the great events of the ancient world into their true places, and shews them in their just proportions; so that his “Outline” rather deserves the name of a “miniature portrait.”

A few extracts will shew this soundness of general historic prin-

ciple. Speaking of the world and the Church, in the days before the flood, Mr. Wilberforce says—

“ Thus early were the principles of human society and the hallowed rule of heavenly contemplation brought into opposition with one another. Both arise from those natural relations with which God has formed mankind, and from those powers and endowments which he has given. But they speedily took leave of one another. Yet the happiness of man’s life depends upon their moving together with an equal pace; and the complete establishment of Christ’s kingdom implies their perfect combination. And the great object of history is to shew how these powers diverged from one another, and how they have again been brought to unite: their times of meeting are the grand epochs in the annals of mankind.”—(p. 6.)

On the uses of the early Assyrian empire he remarks:—

“ The long existence of this vast empire connects the first attempt of worldly ambition with those great events which God was afterwards about to exhibit among mankind. We see more clearly the several stages of the world’s history—four vain attempts on the part of man at binding together all nations, and then the winding up of the mighty history in the kingdom of the Son of God.”—(p. 14.)

On arriving at the third, or Grecian empire, we have the following admirable passage:—

“ The grand object of history has been stated, in these pages, to be the developement of those means by which the lost image of God may be recovered. Prophecy declared, from the first, that this would be obtained through a gift to be bestowed upon one chosen people. Prophecy next took a wider range,—declared what should be the general combinations of human society,—the four great forms of worldly empire—and that they should minister in some way towards the full attainment of this heavenly blessing. The gift, indeed, was to be a gift of God, yet was human instrumentality to concur in its extension. And the first two empires had in reality done their part in this great design. The first, by early concentrating the wealth of the East, had afforded the means of setting forth the spectacle of the latter days in the middle theatre of the world. The second had acted as the preserver of that chosen people, through whom God’s blessing was to be given. And now the third was to supply its portion, by providing an universal language, and by so extending the intellect of man as to enable him to do more justice to the communications of Heaven. But this it did through efforts which had another object, of which the daring design was to attain, through human means, what could only be effected through the gift of God.”—(p. 92.)

The new and portentously calm state of the world in the reign of Augustus, which Mr. Wilberforce aptly terms the “ Crisis of History,” is thus described:—

“ And now the world began to present a very different appearance from anything which had been seen within the recollection of man. None of the three preceding empires had filled the earth so completely as did the Roman. The power of none seemed to be so well compacted. The Romans, who had never been a year at peace since their city was built, were now free from all enemies; and the temple of Janus, which it was their custom to open whenever they went to war, was for the first time permanently closed. Mankind began to look with wonder on what should follow this new state of things. A contemporary heathen historian (Polybius, i. 3.) expresses his surprise at

seeing the whole destiny of the tribes of men thus gathered into a single channel, and ready to expand itself into some unwonted form.

"The general extension of the Greek language throughout the East co-operated with this universal outspread of the Roman power. The truths which had been gathered from the Old Testament worked among the heathen. An universal empire—a reign of peace—the deliverance of mankind,—these they knew were expected. Hence the Roman poet Virgil predicts the birth of one who should bring back the auspicious era of ancient innocence and plenty. (Eclogue iv.) Such were men's expectations; but, as has happened in all times, they expected from the world that which was to be manifested in the Church."—(p. 164.)

These passages will suffice to shew how clearly the map of ancient history is laid down, and how well its proportions and their true causes are stated, in the clever and well-written work before us. We are, however, compelled by justice to say that its merits are considerably alloyed by a certain "Tractarian" tone which pervades the history of the fifth, or Christian empire; and the effect thus produced upon the reader's mind is not weakened by the exhibition of several quotations from Keble's "Christian Year," which appear among the mottoes prefixed to the chapters. The well-known semi-Romanism of those elegant poems ought to cause their exclusion from every honestly Protestant work; and the very appearance of passages taken from them gives a tinge to the pages of Mr. Wilberforce.

Besides, what can we say to such sentences as the following?

"Heresy, however *fatal*, is an *outward* and *temporary* disorder; but schism, however *trivial*, is an *inward* and *lasting* ill."

Thus Pelagian, or Socinian, or semi-Popish principles in the bosom of the Church, are mere "outward and temporary disorders," when compared to the most orthodox dissent, which is a "lasting ill." This may be true as to the government of an Established Church; but we think few of our readers will be prepared to agree in the sentiment, as to the orthodoxy of the Church Catholic.

In page 220 we find Mr. Wilberforce talking of "the *consentient approbation* of the ancient fathers;" although the general consent of those venerable persons is well known to be a discovery which we may place in the same list with that of the perpetual motion, as just about equally probable.

Again (page 228), Mr. Wilberforce says of the Montanists, "no *gross sin* had stained their *baptismal purity*;" as if baptism conferred a freedom from original corruption, or as though the hidden sins of the heart were guiltless compared with those of the outward life.

Another thing which we cannot commend is the frequent reference to that unsound and dangerous author, Gesenius. Those who

write for the young and the unlearned should be peculiarly careful, even as to the names they introduce into their pages. If a rationalist or neologian, or other heterodox writer, *must* be quoted, let the mention of his name be accompanied by some guarding remark; otherwise those who read *really* for information, and are little versed in controversy, will infallibly consider every author as a safe guide who is quoted by "so good a man as Mr. ***;" more especially should he bear a name so time-honoured and universally beloved as that of WILBERFORCE.

We would just mention, by the way, that there are several typographical errors in these foot-note references, which should be attended to. At page 27, note 18, we are referred to Herodotus for a passage in the Bible; and *vice versa*, note 19, to the *sixty-sixth* of Jeremiah for the opinion of Herodotus. This note should have been affixed to the 18, and the chapter should have been the forty-sixth; or, better still, 2 Chron. xxxv. 20. Again, at page 82, note 32, we are referred to iv. Ezra 21. for Artaxerxes, whom we do not find there: probably the figures should have been vii. 23. We do not perceive any table of errata, nor do we know how many similar misprints there may be. We happened accidentally to discover these.

On archæologic subjects, too, we must say a few words. What does Mr. Wilberforce mean by calling Ararat "the *centre* of Asia?" (page 9) whereas it happens to be situated at the western side of that continent; and, comparatively speaking, near its boundary.

The following sentence, in the next page, seems to us somewhat mysterious. "Thus we are assured that we who live in Europe are more akin to the inhabitants of India than either of us are to the Arabians, because our languages are farther removed from theirs *than they are from one another*." (p. 10.) It is clear enough who "*we*" are; not so who are "*they*," and "*one another*." The repeated assertion, that the Indians are of Japheth's race, appears to us somewhat extraordinary, more especially when based on dissimilarity of language; as the Sancreet is usually considered to be much more cognate to the Shemitic languages than to any of the dialects of Europe. The similarities existing between India and Ancient Egypt, which Mr. Wilberforce notices (page 22) as a consequence of Egypt's early settlement, were so strong as to lead Kæmpfer, Brucker, and others to view India as an Egyptian colony. Perhaps the more reasonable mode of accounting for this striking likeness between these distant lands, is to consider the Egyptian priests as an Asiatic colony, which the ancients believed them to be (V. Ouvaroff's Essay on the Mysteries

of Eleusis, 112); and there we shall see that the doctrines, and other points of similarity, set out, in opposite directions, from the common centre at Babel, and reached India on the one side, and Egypt on the other, still retaining their original form: hence the resemblance between these ancient and interesting countries.

Mr. Wilberforce seems to have some singular ideas upon the origin of nations. At page 58 he says, "The Chaldees, a people of *Japhethic* "race," and quotes Gesenius as his authority, without mentioning to what work he refers. Now we have consulted Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, the only work of his in our possession, and we there find him quoting himself *against* the opinion of Michaelis and others, that the Chaldees were a Slavonic race. Their very name (*Chashdion* or *Cashdion*) seems to stamp them of the race of Ham, at least so some of the learned have considered. At any rate, if they were, as Mr. Wilberforce says, "a Japhethic race," who had "become the masters" of Babylon, it is singular that the language spoken by them, and called by their name, should be so closely allied to the Hebrew, which is the parent of the Shemitic languages, and of some of the Hamite ones, if not indeed of every other. The resemblance between the Hebrew and Chaldee is indeed so strong, that they do not differ more from each other than does the language of Lisbon from that of Madrid, or the English of St. James's-street from that spoken in St. Giles'.

Mr. Wilberforce has also a strong tendency towards what has been called "the historic system" of mythology—that scheme of Euhemerus, which represented all the gods of paganism to be only deified men. Undoubtedly the deeds of martial heroes were much mixed up, by blind tradition, with the legends of the gods; but we must believe that the extraordinary births, conquests, deaths, and resurrections of many among the ancient deities had a higher origin than any mere apotheosis of men.

As we approach the end of the book, we find the argument sadly crippled by the limitation of the Fifth Empire to the invisible and spiritual kingdom of Christ; by this means the parallel between it and its predecessors is nearly destroyed, and the grand prophecies of Scripture are shorn of half their meaning. Mr. Wilberforce has exhibited some of the other empires, as growing up during the last stages of those that immediately preceded them; and indeed he describes the kingdom of Christ as not fully developed until the fall of the Roman empire. Now, we will only say that, had he considered the present spiritual kingdom as still growing up under the last phase of the Roman power, Popery—and as being only the forerunner and germ of that universal king-

dom, both spiritual and *temporal*, which is predicted, but has never yet been accomplished—instead of describing it as the sole end and mighty termination of the whole Divine scheme, his plan would have been far more impressive and harmonious.

Having thus very fully stated our objections to a work which a few alterations would render invaluable, we must refresh ourselves and our readers by extracting some of its beauties. We should like to present a great many of them, including Mr. Wilberforce's attacks upon Arianism, Popery, and the infidelity of Gibbon: but our limits will not allow us to give more than the following:—

“The first of the four monarchies had now reached its height. Its capital, Babylon, was the greatest as well as the most ancient city in the world. The most civilized and best-peopled portions of the earth were subject to it. The heirs of that Divine promise, which has bound together the most distant parts of the world, were swallowed up for a time in its greatness; but just at this season, He who has given bounds to the deep was pleased to declare what should be the limits to man's ambition, and where its proud waves should be stayed. At the very moment when the first empire had reached its greatness, and when it touched upon the humble polity of Israel, which its breath seemed enough to sweep away, God declared the vanity of earthly greatness, and the eternal endurance of his people. The prophecy of the latter days was given when the spiritual and temporal seed came thus in contact with one another. The concurrence of both was needed to give expression to God's decree, as the union of both was needed to fulfil it. It seemed, therefore, as if another of those great epochs were at hand, when the history of mankind was to be gathered into a single channel. But the union was but for a season. It was not given to the possessors of Nimrod's corrupt kingdom, even though it had fallen into the hands of the more vigorous Chaldæans, to combine permanently with the heirs of promise, and thus to produce between them those great events, which were to consummate the fortunes of the world. The office of this first monarchy was but to lead the way; to indicate what should follow. Yet, in order to shew how it ministered to the great things of after-times, the temporal power was chosen to receive the vision of what should follow, when its course terminated in the kingdom of Christ.”—(pp. 65, 66.)

The Roman power is thus described:—

“Thus that spectacle was exhibited which Daniel had long before discerned with the eye of prophecy. To ‘devour,’ to ‘tread down,’ and to ‘break in pieces,’ was exactly Rome's office among the nations. Every thing must bend and yield to the iron sceptre of its sway. Before time the aspect of the world had been diversified. There were republics in Europe, and monarchies in Asia; the East had her cavalry, the West her foot-soldiers; some cities were enriched by commerce, others distinguished for arts and arms. But now all was frozen up in the cold uniformity of this iron empire. The old forms, whether of empire or freedom, were trampled under foot and forgotten. The ministers of the world sent forth her prætors and proconsuls to rule instead of kings: she spread abroad her colonies to be a model and rule for cities; she imposed her laws and customs on nations the most dissimilar; and so ‘dreadful and terrible’ was she that none might gainsay her. Vast roads, uniform and unbending, were the tracks which she made for herself throughout the world, that so the most inaccessible countries might be laid open to her armies; and in making them, she hewed through mountains and filled up valleys, as though the earth was as subject to her as its inhabitants.”—(p. 157, 158.)

We have room for only one more extract, on the establishment of Christianity in Rome:—

“Now, then, came the conflict which was to decide the history of the world. For a little hour the victory seemed in suspense—while Paganism and the Church were entwined in the death-struggle together. The eyes of all men were on the event: for the fall of Dagon was not, as of old, in darkness and silence—it was acted on the middle stage of earth—its scene-plot was the Roman empire. The Church of God had emerged from Babylonish bondage, and flourished under Persian protection: it had spread through the channels of Grecian civilization, and now it was to exact homage from the majesty of Rome; it had trampled on the pride of the Stoics, and contemned the alluring arts of Epicurus; and now it defied the swords of thirty legions, and the arm which swayed from Euphrates to the ocean.”—(p. 238.)

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN GEORGE BREAY, B.A.,
&c. &c. *With a Selection from his Correspondence..* By a
MEMBER OF HIS CONGREGATION. London: *Hamilton*. 1841.
THE LIFE AND REMAINS OF THE REV. ROBERT
HOUSMAN, A.B., &c. By R. F. HOUSMAN, Esq. London:
Simpkin. 1841.

THE biography of Christian men, and especially of Christian Ministers, can never be devoid of interest to the Church, unless it be most unfairly or most injudiciously compiled: unless the brighter tints on the canvass be so diffused throughout the portraiture, as to exclude altogether the grateful relief which is derived from the contrast of shade, and we have before our eyes “some faultless monster whom the world ne’er saw” instead of a man of like passions, like frailties, like infirmities with ourselves. Where the Christian is permitted, however, to tell his own tale—to unravel the mysteries of his own experience, and to develope in his own words the consciousness of what passes within—that contrast will not be wanting. In the instances now before us, especially the former, we should have risen from the Memoir with the painful sensation of one who had been occupied in gazing upon an overstrained and exaggerated picture, had it not been for the most seasonable accompaniment of the Correspondence. We do not, however, say this as reflecting in the slightest degree upon the candour or judgment of the intelligent writer. We entertain no manner of doubt that he faithfully declared “what he knew and testified what he had seen;” and we are persuaded that his intention was simply to allow Mr. Breay to say concerning himself what none could have said of him. This we infer from his expressed

desire, "that every reader may be enabled to turn from the perusal of his narrative, and particularly of the interspersed letters, with a resolution, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, to go and do likewise."

It will not be expected, nor is it to be desired, that we should enter into detail respecting the subject of either of these volumes. We should only transfer a meagre and scanty outline to our pages, which must be filled up by reference to the works themselves; and we would not willingly furnish any "fellow-labourer in the word and doctrine" with an apology for leaving unread such a work as the Memoir of Mr. Breay. He was indeed "a burning and a shining light"—but he was so, without any of those early indications of surpassing talent which seem from the beginning to distance all competitors—and even without any striking manifestations of that innate energy and expansiveness of mind, which no sooner finds a region suited to its full display, than it kindles into active operation, and astonishes those who had not even dreamed of its existence. Mr. Breay was not, certainly, a man of extraordinary powers (though few knew better how to combine good sense and sound doctrine,) nor yet, perhaps, a man of extraordinary diligence and perseverance (though few, we think, have accomplished more important designs within a similar sphere of action, and in a given space of time,) but he did unquestionably possess in an eminent degree one quality of superlative excellence as a Minister of the Gospel—singleness of mind. Of him it might be said, as of the Apostle, that "one thing he did"—one object he pursued—he gave himself WHOLLY to those things; he brought all the powers of a manly and vigorous, if not a superior mind, to bear upon the work of the ministry—and the consequence was, that "his profiting appeared to all." In all that man admires in the scholar, and eulogizes in the theologian, he was not, and he did not profess or even desire to be, among the Lights of his age, but few have excelled him in the "wisdom of winning souls." And verily, even on this side the grave, he had all the recompense which could be offered in the esteem, love, and we might say veneration of thousands of the population among whom he ministered. If the mingled prayers of many sorrowing hearts could have detained him in the body, his life would have been prolonged to this hour; and when it pleased God, in the flower of his age, and apparently in the meridian of his usefulness, to summon him to his rest, "devout men followed him to his burial, and made great lamentation over him." The memorials of his earthly sojourn remain in the place of his ministrations, and by them he, being dead, yet speaketh—and will speak to generations yet to come.

We think, then, that the portraiture of Mr. Breay is singularly valuable, because so far as we can see, there is not a feature developed, not a lineament displayed, which should deter the youthful and timid divine (and we wish *all* youthful divines were timid, or at least modest) from endeavouring to "go and do likewise." He is, in all respects, a safe and a practicable model for imitation. The grace that made him what he was, may—without deviating from the ordinary course of its operation to work an intellectual change, a revolution, and remodelling of the mind—make nine clergymen out of every ten, or perhaps ninety-nine out of every hundred, equally active, equally efficient, and equally successful. It is true, that few in comparison are placed in an equally extensive sphere, and in few, therefore, are the powers and capacities imparted by the gospel equally called forth—but a reliance, like Mr. Breay's, on the sufficiency of grace, will never fail to draw after it the sufficiency to which it trusts. Instead of furnishing extracts therefore, we cordially recommend the entire work; and we think it especially adapted for those who are just meditating the consecration of themselves to God in the sacred office of the ministry. They can scarcely listen to Mr. Breay's counsels without imbibing a portion of his spirit: they can scarcely look upon his example without the desire to tread in his steps—a desire, which will bring about its own accomplishment, if nurtured by humility, and seconded by prayer!

We almost doubt, however, on a re-examination of the volume, whether we have done full justice to Mr. Breay's powers of mind, which, where he felt strongly, and wrote as he felt, were proportionably developed. Few men could have touched more usefully and more powerfully, within the same compass, the important subject of the distinctive marks of the Spirit's teaching, which we find in pages 378—382, treated in a letter to a friend—a letter too, of which the writer says, "that he had not even time to read what he had written." A few of these remarks are so applicable to the controversy which at present agitates, and convulses, and threatens ere long to dislocate and dismantle the church that we cannot but transfer them to our pages. Oh how much good might be effected, how much evil prevented, could we but write them on a *single* heart!

"Intellectual pride may be exercised even in spiritual investigation. A desire to be taught may be professed, and that without hypocrisy, where prejudice and self-will are, insensibly perhaps, dominant in their influence. Divine education consists in training, if I may so express myself, the dispositions of the children of God. The creature must be humbled, and emptied, and brought to feel, as well as to confess, helplessness and dependency; and this is effected by different processes to different minds. Error in opi-

nion may be both the punishment and cure of the praying, but self-complacent Church professor."

Commending these remarks to those whom they especially concern—Christian professors, whose errors in opinion have been their punishment, and may yet, we trust, become their cure—we pass onward to the life and memoirs of the Rev. R. Housman. This, however, is scarcely equal in style and in arrangement, and decidedly inferior in interest, to the work already considered. Amiable, excellent, and useful as Mr. Housman was, during a life extended beyond the ordinary term, we doubt not that there is a large circle of Christian friends by whom the work will be highly prized—and the "Remains," which constitute nearly one half of the volume, must render it profitable to readers of every class. Indeed, we would recommend the perusal of two or three of the discourses previously to entering upon the Life. "The mind of the Preacher, as developed in his ministrations, will act as a key to many of the expressions in his correspondence, and to some of the incidents in his life. We do not indeed pledge ourselves to all his views of the doctrine—still less of the discipline of the church—but he was "a good man and full of faith," and his name will ever hold a conspicuous place among those, who deserve to be "esteemed very highly in love for their works' sake"—who are the blessing of their own generation and the example of generations yet to come.

We do not know whether the biographer has adopted the principles of his Father, but we are sure that under no circumstances would the venerable Mr. Housman have countenanced such an attack upon the most ancient and dignified of our ecclesiastical institutions as we find in the following words:—"He took counsel's opinion upon the 50th and 52nd canons, as to the legal privilege of occasionally admitting a friend into his pulpit. The opinion was favourable.

"Times are happily altered now: unwieldy and obsolete ecclesiastical regulations are becoming powerless to obstruct the free course and progress of the Gospel. *Even bishops, as a body, are beginning to feel*, that the letter which killeth is subordinate to the spirit which giveth life, and that a minister may deliver the message of salvation in a manner accessible to the God of Salvation, *though he does now and then run foul of articles and canons.*"

We should be pained to animadvert, as the circumstances might seem to require, upon the introduction of such a sentence into such a work. We would rather ascribe it to inadvertence on the part of the biographer, or to intemperance into which he was betrayed by excess of dutiful affection, than to any deliberate intention of gratuitously attacking the articles and canons of that church, to which his excellent relative was so warmly and conscientiously attached. Were it otherwise, we should protest in terms of the most indignant repro-

bation against a practice, not unfrequent in biographical sketches ; but when designed, most disingenuous and dishonest—that of insinuating under the specious covert of an honourable name, opinions diametrically opposed to those of him who bore it. We do not think, that on the occasion alluded to, Mr. Housman was treated with as much courtesy and consideration as his years, his infirmities, and his usefulness might justly have claimed at the hand of his diocesan ; but in his prompt submission to lawful authority, even when arbitrarily and harshly exercised, he was, as in all beside, “an example to the believers ;” and we think that his biographer might have been ashamed of the ungenerous and unbecoming reflection, after he had himself penned the following words (p. cccxlviii) concerning Bishop Cleaver’s successor in the see of Chester :—

“ The excellent bishop, who had invariably treated Mr. Housman with the most gratifying and distinguished marks of kindness, accompanied his acquiescence in the wishes of the venerable minister with a very affectionate testimony to the fidelity and usefulness of his past life, and with the expression of an earnest hope, that St. Ann’s might long continue to be tended by a pastor not less sound in his doctrinal principles, and equally faithful in declaring them.”

When will men cease from the uncandid and unreasonable practice of inculcating the system, on account of the personal deficiencies or delinquencies of those by whom it is administered ? If a former Bishop of Chester, in the exercise of lawful authority, exhibited too much of the “ Lord over God’s heritage,” is it not obvious to Mr. Housman that the fault was not one of principle, but of manner, and that the principle of the Church was right, though the manner of the prelate might be that of a “ lord bishop” rather than a “ fellow-elder ?” We trust that on a second edition, should such be required, the obnoxious passage will be expunged : *if not*, it will be a **DELIBERATE** insult to the memory of a good man, as well as to the highest authorities of the Church which he so affectionately regarded, and so eminently adorned.

BRIEF STATEMENT of some Objections to Portions of the System and Practice of the Church Missionary Society.
By A CLERICAL MEMBER. London: Rivingtons. 1841.

AMONG the various subjects to be lamented, in the present state of our Church, is an increasing disposition, among the friends of our various religious Societies, to assail and decry those associations to which they do not happen to have attached themselves. This fault, however, is chiefly perceptible on one side. We are not aware that the friends of the Church Missionary Society, or of the Pastoral Aid Society, have made any attack on their fellow-labourers in similar fields. It is from the supporters of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, and of the Additional Curates' Fund, that censures on their brethren engaged in kindred institutions chiefly emanate. It is among men who are very profuse with their "calls to union," that these incentives to division are chiefly to be found.

It is, we regret to say, matter of history, that up to the year 1801 very little was done by the Church of England with reference to the great duty of sending the gospel to the heathen. It is true, that just one century before (1701), a charter was issued by King William, constituting some bishops, with divers other persons, a corporation for the propagation of the gospel in foreign parts. It is also true that, in course of time, the whole bench of bishops accorded their patronage to this society. After a century's growth, therefore, and being thus highly patronized, it began to be called "the Venerable Society." Venerable, however, as it might be, and possessing the support of the whole episcopacy of England, it is not the less a fact, that the amount of its efforts and their fruits was exceedingly small. In the year 1714, the total produce of its annual subscriptions was £734. In 1731 they had fallen to £515. And in 1818 they were but £483.

We may say, therefore, that for more than a century the missionary zeal of what Dr. Hook would call "the High Church party" in England, even with the whole bench of bishops to aid, had scarcely sufficed to raise, in annual subscriptions, the stipends of two missionaries!

In the year 1801, however, some of the contemned and despised "Low Church party" began to lay this matter to heart. Such men as Scott, and Simeon, and Biddulph, and Robinson came together, and consulted what they might do to cause the name of Christ to be preached among the heathen. They formed an association for that purpose. There was no law, human or divine, to

forbid their collecting funds for the purpose of sending missionaries to the Susoos or Cingalese. They proceeded, therefore, and God made the cause to prosper in their hands. Their income was, we believe, about £2000 in the first year; in 1820 it was £31,076; in 1840 it was £103,000. They have now above eighty missionary stations, in which there are employed nearly 700 agents, about 100 of whom are ordained clergymen. They have about 3000 communicants, and more than 28,000 children under tuition.

This great work had been in progress about twenty years, before the old Society for Propagating the Gospel awakened from its slumbers. It was about the year 1820, we believe, that its annual income rose to £1458 (exclusive of a parliamentary grant) the income of the Church Missionary Society being in that year £31,076. Four years after, the receipts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel by annual subscribers were £1964,—(less than *two thousand* a year, 124 years after its formation!) and from that time to the present a succession of vigorous efforts have been put forth, till, in the last year, its income had mounted up to £40,000,—the income of the Church Missionary Society being £103,000.

But now comes in a new evil. Apathy and sloth is changed into emulation; but that emulation soon becomes tinged with party spirit. A jealous feeling has lately shewn itself in various quarters, and objections are raised to the *very existence* of the Church Missionary Society. It is “not a Church Society,”—“not a Society which a real churchman can support;” “it tends to division and rivalry,”—forgetting, as such objectors very conveniently do, that it is only of late that any rivalry has existed; and that such rivalry is merely caused by the efforts of the “venerable society” to imitate the example of its younger sister. One of these objectors is now before us. Either he is a determined opponent, essaying to mask himself in the garb of a friend; or else he is one who scarcely knows his own mind. He describes himself as “a Clerical Member of the Church Missionary Society;” and yet, at p. 7, he describes a clergyman “whose principles, as a churchman, will not allow him to join that Society.” He gives no opinion as to the error of these “principles.” Yet they must be erroneous, or the writer himself, in describing himself as a member, is affixing to his own character the stigma of being an unsound churchman.

But what is the drift of the pamphlet:—what are the “portions of the system and practice of the Church Missionary Society” of which it complains?

We regret to say that in seeking to find out these we have met with much in the writer's own representations which is of a deceptive character. There is nothing like a plain and candid statement of the differences between the two Societies which he professes to compare. Here is his first ground of objection:—

"It is maintained that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is alone, *strictly speaking*, the *Church Missionary Society*; because that association alone can be properly called a part of the *Church* which distinctly recognises both the doctrine and discipline of the Church, and gives to each member of the Church the power and authority assigned to him by the Church. The Church Missionary Society does not do this; for in its "*Laws and Regulations*" *there is no recognition whatever of the office and authority of the bishops of the Church*. They are, it is true, once alluded to under the title of "*Spiritual Peers*," but they are placed on a level with the "*Peers Temporal*;" and by the regulations, a priest or deacon, or even a layman, subscribing to the Church Missionary Society, has as much power in the executive of the society as has any one of the bishops.

"The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel claims to be true to the Church in this matter, in which the Church Missionary Society is wanting. By their charter of incorporation, granted in 1701, five of the members were bishops of the church; the seven others were clergymen holding high offices in the Church. This body judged it wise to call to their counsels a larger body of their brethren, who are also called incorporated members, three hundred in number, elected from the subscribers. But, in so doing, they made it a law of the society, that "*the bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland*" be always members of this enlarged corporation,—*thereby recognising the episcopal office as an essential portion of a Church association*. If it be objected, as it sometimes is, that by this extended incorporation the inferior members of the Church may sit at the society's board, having equality of vote with his superior, it may be fairly replied, that the *principle* recognised by *the adoption of all bishops, as ex-officio members of the society*, may be naturally expected to pervade and affect the proceedings of the board; and it is further asserted, that *it does so*; for it is affirmed, and we challenge contradiction, that *no measure of importance is ever adopted by the society until it has been submitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the President of the Society, and the Primate of the English Church, for his approval*. Therefore it is maintained, that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is, in this matter, as distinguished from the Church Missionary Society, a truly Church society."—(pp. 4, 5.)

Now we must designate this as a most uncandid and unfair representation. What are the facts?

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was not formed by "*the Church*," or by the bishops of the Church. A few bishops (five only, says this writer,) took part in forming the Society. That it has been customary of late years, for each bishop, on his promotion, to give his name to the Society, is we believe, the case, and that so joining it, he becomes a member, is true, and it is also true of the Church Missionary and Church Pastoral Aid Societies. Every bishop who chooses to join those Societies, is immediately made a Vice-President. There is no essential difference between the Societies, in this respect.

But the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primate of the English Church, is *President of that Society*! True, but how comes he to be so? Is there any law of the Society which assigns him this place in virtue of his Archiepiscopate, as, from the above paragraph, the reader would be inclined to suppose?

There is nothing of the kind. The Archbishop is *elected*, annually elected, to this office; and there is nothing whatever in the laws or constitution of the Society to point towards his Grace in this election; or to prevent the election of a layman, such as Sir John Hobhouse, or Sir Stephen Lushington, if the members at their annual meeting should choose to make such a choice. What a fiction, then, is this whole representation, which would exalt the Propagation Society at the expense of its younger sister, as “distinctly recognizing the doctrine and discipline of the Church.”

But we pass on to the second head of complaint, which is, “that this grand defect in the constitution of the Church Missionary Society is manifest in its practice also.”

Strangely, indeed, does the writer proceed in the attempt to make good his charge. He begins thus, “First of all, *at home*. The Bishops of the Church, *as a body*, have never joined the Society.”

Is it not an odd way of establishing a charge against the Society’s *practice*, to adduce, first and foremost, a circumstance which can by no possibility form any part of that practice? Is the abstaining of the bishops, “as a body,” from doing a certain thing, any part of the *wrong-doing* of the Society?

But farther; does not the writer see that the very same charge might be brought against the elder society, which he so strenuously endeavours to exalt at the cost of the Church Missionary Society? It is just as true of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, as of the Church Missionary Society,—that “the Bishops, *as a body*, have never joined the Society.”

It may be true, indeed, that all or nearly all of these prelates may have *individually* joined the Propagation Society; but assuredly they never joined it “as a body.” The Society was first formed by a few bishops, joined with a number of other persons, lay as well as clerical. We advance a few years in its progress, and we find it stated in their *Papers*, of the date of 1706, that eleven other bishops “had been *elected* members.” Of course *election* implies the possibility of rejection. There was nothing, then, in the laws and constitution of the Society, to have prevented them from *rejecting* these prelates, had they been so inclined. They went on, very naturally, however, admitting such bishops as offered themselves, but in no report that we have examined, until

of late years,—and we have looked over several, (as 1715, 1731, 1742, and others) do we find the whole of the episcopal bench. For half a century, at least, the bishops, "as a body," were not even members; and certain it is, that if the whole are now on the Society's list, it is merely *as individuals* that they are there. The assertion of the writer of this Tract, that the Propagation Society was "*speedily* joined by *all* the bishops;"—is absolutely incorrect, and inconsistent with the fact.

The main charge, however, remains behind. It is thus stated:—

"The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, consistently anxious to uphold the doctrine and discipline of the Church abroad, as well as at home, has the two following laws:—

"Law 18. 'That every missionary, catechist, and schoolmaster, in the employment of the society, be subject to the ecclesiastical authorities of the country in which he may be placed.'

"Law 19. 'That no catechist or schoolmaster be allowed to read prayers or sermons, unless he be first nominated by the missionary, and licensed by the bishop, or other chief ecclesiastical authority.'

"These two laws are a most important guarantee that the discipline of the Church will be faithfully preserved by the missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. To these laws the Church Missionary Society has nothing bearing any affinity. In those regulations which affect its missionaries there is no allusion whatever to any ecclesiastical authority. *The committee alone* are declared to be that power to whom the missionaries are responsible."—(pp. 7, 8.)

Now this is uncandid; inasmuch as it overlooks the main difference between the two societies. The elder society was formed, as the writer of the tract before us states, in another page,

"For the joint purpose of upholding the gospel among settlers in the colonies, factories, and plantations of Great Britain, and of propagating it among the heathen, by whom they were surrounded."—(p. 11.)

Now the Church Missionary Society was not formed for the purpose of taking the work of the elder society out of its hands; but to do something *quite different*. The Propagation Society proposed to send its missionaries to the colonies of Great Britain, and "*to the heathen by whom they were surrounded*." Not to the heathen generally, but to the heathen lying adjacent to British settlements. Now in taking this course what could be more natural or proper than to provide against rivalry, irregularity, or insubordination, by placing its missionaries under the superintendence of the ecclesiastical authorities of the colonies to which they were sent? But the Church Missionary Society was formed for the purpose of sending missionaries, not to our own colonies, but to the heathen;—to the natives of Africa, New Zealand, Abyssinia, Ceylon, and India: places where, until within the last few years, no ecclesiastical authority of any kind existed. Such

a rule, therefore, if passed in the year 1801 or even in 1821, would have been merely absurd. It would have had no meaning.

It may, however, be said, that of late several bishops, archdeacons, and others, have been appointed; and that now at least, an alteration is needed.

This opens a grave and serious question; and one which cannot be disposed of in the short and simple way which this tract-writer would suggest. He would counsel an entire and implicit submission to every such newly-appointed colonial bishop, without the least regard to circumstances.

The Society, for instance, may have been labouring for a period of twenty or thirty years, to build up a mission in a spot surrounded with difficulties and dangers. The peculiarities of the case may be many, and may be known only to the managing Committee. But, after being left entirely to themselves for a quarter of a century, it pleases Lord John Russell or Sir John Hobhouse, by a stroke of the pen, to create a bishopric at some spot perhaps a thousand miles off, and to place the sphere of this particular mission under such bishop's jurisdiction.

At once, then, according to this relentless theory, the whole work of the past twenty years ought to be thrown at the feet of the newly-appointed prelate. No matter that he is entirely ignorant of all the matters connected with it; no matter that his residence may be at three weeks' journey from the station; no matter that his sole recommendation to the episcopate may have been his relationship with a relation of a Secretary of State—all this is to be thrown aside; and the whole affairs of the Mission are to be placed at his absolute disposal!

So hasty and inconsiderate a proposition cannot be supported. We freely and willingly admit, that the appointment of a bishop to a colonial see, however extensive, and however beyond the possibility of an "oversight," properly so called,—makes a great difference in the position of the committee in London; and calls for a serious consideration of the new relations in which the missionaries are placed. But these are matters which require to be handled with care and judgment, and not decided, as the writer of this tract would propose, at a single stroke of the pen. Still less is it just or honest, to charge *that* as a fundamental defect in the Society's constitution, which naturally and necessarily arose out of the nature and character of its original object and plan.

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

JUNE, 1841.

OXFORD DIVINITY COMPARED WITH THAT OF THE ROMISH AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES, &c. &c. By the Right Rev. CHARLES P. M'ILVAINE, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio. London: *Seeley & Burnside.* 1841.

OUR last number commenced with two grave charges against the doctors and disciples of the Oxford school, which were expressed in the solemn words of Holy Writ, "They have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, which will hold no water." The former of these charges was but too well substantiated by the evidence of Tract No. 90, the most portentous publication of modern times: the latter is brought home with consummate skill, and cogent reasoning, and overwhelming accumulation of evidence, in the admirable and most seasonable production now before us. The Bishop of Ohio has thoroughly explored and sounded the "broken cisterns" of Oxfordism, and proved to demonstration that they will hold none of the pure water of the fountain of life. Their sole contents are the putrid sediment of anti-scriptural error—the slimy deposit of anti-Christian superstition.

One objection, and one only, has presented itself to us in the examination of this work, which we state *in limine*, not to detract from the distinguished merits of the Author, but to account for the character of our own remarks. The volume is, we fear, too formidable in its bulk, too complex in its reasoning, too minute in

its details, too amplified in its statement of authorities, to become as popular as it deserves—to become as extensively useful as it is eminently calculated to be. It will be an invaluable gift to those who are constrained by their position, or competent by their attainments, to study and sift the question at issue; but it is not likely to be appreciated, at least in its present form, by the great body of readers, who are unable or unwilling to do more than skim the surface. The noble array of “standard divines,” whom Bishop M’Ilvaine has drawn up with such dexterity of arrangement, and in so compact a phalanx, as the defenders of that bastion which is the key to the citadel of the Anglican Church—the doctrine of Justification by Faith—are known to many of her professing members scarcely by name; and yet these last require, equally with the learned, to be furnished with an answer to those who would examine or ensnare them;—yet these also require some caution, which may preserve them from diverging out of the way of truth and soberness into the misnamed “Via Media,” which, professing to lead through Oxford, does in reality conduct to Rome. This is the more needful, as it is one among the subtleties of those who lie in wait to beguile unstable souls, and who undermine Church foundations while professing to uphold Church principles, to parade before the eye of the unwary reader a “List of Works which uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in their Tracts;” comprehending not only Pusey, Newman, Keble, Hook, et hoc genus omne, but the honoured names of Bishops Andrews, Taylor, Beveridge, Jebb, and Wilson. We wish Bishop M’Ilvaine had subjoined to his work a list of authors quoted by him on the other side; not only would his luminous “cloud of witnesses” have far overspread and altogether obscured the other, but among its “bright particular stars” would have shone forth Andrews, Taylor, Beveridge, who are much more opposed to the Oxford divines, on this primary article of doctrine, than accordant with them on subordinate points of discipline. We proceed, however, to give an account of the work before us, only regretting that No. 90 did not cross the Atlantic in time to occupy its due position in this volume, of which it realizes the gravest apprehensions, and verifies the strongest statements. To apply an expression of the Tractarians themselves, if their previous publications are Romanism in rudiment, No. 90 is Romanism in development. They have done these things in the green tree—what will they do in the dry? “Scarcely any unprofessional reader,” says Dr. M’Ilvaine, “would discover in the Tracts alone the several distinctive doctrines of the system.” This passage, we are sure, will be expunged from his second edition, when he has perused No. 90.

It is not then, as might be inferred, from the Tracts alone that Bishop M'Ilvaine has collected the doctrines of the party, nor upon them accordingly that he has constructed his refutation. Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, designated by the Author "an *explicit* confession of his views," and Mr. Newman's Lectures on Justification, are taken as the two columns which support the temple of this modern Dagon, and our transatlantic Samson has embraced them with a grasp which has brought the whole fabric to the ground. He has selected that great fundamental principle of the gospel, which, as stated in the 11th, 12th, and 13th Articles of our Church, makes the main doctrinal feature of the Protestant orthodox faith, and, viewed in an opposite aspect, makes the main doctrinal feature of Romanism. He inquires to which of the two contrasted views of this main principle the essential features of Oxford divinity are most conformed; and finding that they are conformed to the view of Rome, and opposed to that of the Church of England, he comes to the conclusion, that Oxfordism is essential Romanism—Romanism in the rudiment—and not only that it is Romanism in essence, but that, in proportion as the times will allow, and opportunity shall be given, it will become Romanism in full manifestation—Romanism in undisguised development. The mine is already sunk—the train is already laid—nothing remains but the explosion, and No. 90 is the blue light that should warn us to prepare for it.

The question between Anglicans and Oxfordists is stated by Bishop M'Ilvaine, not in his own words, but in those of a writer who occupies a place, though the last and lowest, in the commendatory List of the Tractarians, as one "whose works may be profitably studied;" not, however, as upholding and elucidating their general doctrines, which, though he has been edited by Keble, and applauded by Hook, yet Mr. Newman is compelled to acknowledge he contradicts—that Hooker, whom our fathers used to call "judicious," and whom we, it is trusted, have not ceased to think so. "The grand question," he says, "that hangeth in controversy between us and Rome is about the matter of justifying righteousness. We disagree—

- (I.) About the nature and essence of the medicine whereby Christ cureth our disease;
- (II.) About the manner of applying it;
- (III.) About the number and the power of means which God requireth in us for the effectual applying thereof to our soul's comfort."

On these it will be desirable to state, as briefly as possible, the extremes of Anglican and Romanist belief:—

The Anglican holds, that we are justified (accounted righteous before God) only through the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ ;
 The Romanist, by righteousness, imparted by Christ, but inherent in us ;

The Anglican, that Christ's righteousness is applied by faith alone, in order to the sacraments ;

The Romanist, by baptism, in order to its infusion, and by the Eucharist, in order to its profession ;

The Anglican, that sanctification, the immediate and necessary consequence of justification, is promoted and advanced by means ordained of God—the Word, the Sacraments, Private and Public Prayer ;

The Romanist, that it cannot be complete without the use of certain means devised by man, such as Auricular Confession, Sacerdotal Penances, Extreme Unction, Holy Water, Prayer for the Dead, Ave Marias, Masses, Pilgrimages, &c. &c.

The difference or disagreement about No. I., which is first to be considered, has thus been clearly and concisely stated by Mr. Faber :

“The Church of Rome makes the procuring cause of justification to be our own infused, and therefore inherent and internal righteousness ;

The Church of England, on the contrary, and all the other Reformed Churches, make the procuring cause to be the extrinsic righteousness of Christ, apprehended and appropriated by the instrumental hand of faith.”

What do the Oxford divines make it ?

“It is usual at the present day,” writes Mr. Newman, “to lay great stress on the distinction between deliverance from guilt and deliverance from sin ; to lay down as a first principle, that these are two coincident indeed, and contemporary, but altogether independent benefits ; to call them justification and renewal, and to consider that any confusion between them argues serious and alarming ignorance of Christian truth. This distinction is not scriptural. To justify, *means* counting righteous, but includes under the meaning making righteous ; in other words, the sense of the *term* is counting righteous, and the name of the thing denoted by it is making righteous. In the abstract it is counting righteous ; in the concrete a making righteous*.”

“Now, since justification, replies Bishop M'Ilvaine, “is an accounting of us righteous only in the sense of the *term*, and since it is a *making* of us righteous in the sense of the *thing* denoted by it ; and as we are seeking for a thing, when we ask what is the righteousness by which we are justified, and care only for terms as

* Newman's Lectures, pp. 42, 43—129, 129.

far as they denote things, we must be excused if we lay aside the above distinctions as vain and worthless, and conclude that justification, according to Mr. Newman, is neither more nor less than making us righteous, by a righteousness inherent, wrought in us by the grace flowing from Christ's atonement. In other words, it is neither less nor more than sanctification. This, then, is the righteousness by which we are justified before God, according to Oxfordism; the same inwrought, inherent righteousness, which in all true divinity is called sanctification.

Hence justification, according to this divinity, is progressive, varying as sanctification varies. According to them, when a sinner first turns to God, his past sins are pardoned freely, through the merits of Christ; after that, his acceptableness depends on his fulfilling the law. He fulfils the law by having righteousness implanted in his heart at baptism, for Christ's sake. By that he works out his salvation. His works are now *good in themselves*. Love is imputed to him for righteousness. His life is *available, justifying*. He looks *unto himself*, to a *cross within*, for acceptableness and peace. He can, he does fulfil the law for righteousness unto salvation. Justification, at its commencement, was chiefly pardon; it becomes less and less as it advances; and becomes more and more simply sanctification. It ends in being not pardon, but all sanctification; so that, as Mr. Newman expressly says, "the righteousness wherein we must stand at the last day is not Christ's own imputed obedience, but *our good works*."

What inference must be drawn from such a statement by those who are taught by the Church of which Mr. Newman still calls himself a member, that "good works cannot endure the severity of God's judgment," must be obvious. They cannot stand at all. And if they flatter themselves that they have a refuge from this stern and comfortless system in the precedent of St. Paul, who expresses his desire to "win Christ and be found of Him, not having his own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith," Oxford divinity scares them from it, as though it were a refuge of lies. It is denied that the Apostle speaks of two kinds of righteousness; the one his own, of works, the other of Christ and of faith;—the former, of the law; the latter, not of the law—it is maintained that he speaks throughout only of a righteousness of the law of obedience, of works, a righteousness of his own—and that the only difference intended is that between obedience in a natural state, by one's own strength, and obedience in a converted state, by grace helping; obedience inwrought by

the grace of God, in Christ, and therefore called the righteousness of God by faith. If, however, the stubborn Anglican refuses, as well he may, to adopt an interpretation so unworthy of the Apostle, and so distressing to himself—if he persists in believing, as well he may, that justification is one thing, and sanctification another that “follows after it,” and both in Christ alone, let him fly to another refuge from which he cannot be driven;—unless with Mr. Newman four are three, as well as two are one, “Christ Jesus, who, of God, is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.”

But who can wonder at this? “It is a great mistake,” says the Tractarian in No. 80, “to suppose that by preaching the Atonement we are preaching that which St. Paul meant when he said, ‘We preach Christ crucified.’ It is the opposite of this modern notion which St. Paul always intends by it. It is the necessity of our being crucified to the world, it is our humiliation with Him, mortification of the flesh,” &c. *If it were*, we think the Apostle would hardly have proceeded to say that Christ crucified was “the power of God and the wisdom of God,” when these very same results are more strikingly manifested under the influence of the most deplorable and debasing superstition, and the austerities of the Indian Faquir, attempting to propitiate Juggernaut, transcend the penances and endurances of anchorites, conventuals, recluses, ten times told.* We think he would hardly have regarded any extremity of human mortification as setting forth God’s glory, and illustrating God’s wisdom, expressions which yet are perfectly clear, if we understand them as we *have* done—and notwithstanding the presumed greatness of our mistake, intend to do—concerning that which shews how “God can be just, and yet the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus”—how “He, who knew no sin, was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.” This is what we have been accustomed to look upon, when the hand of the Apostle elevated his Master’s cross—and are we now to behold the Lamb of God not as crucified, but crucifying; not suffering for us, but

* See, the sage hermit, by mankind admired,
With all that bigotry adopts inspired,
Wearing out life in his religious whim,
Till his religious whimsey wears out him;
The Bramin kindles on his own bare head
The sacred fire, self-torturing his trade!
Which is the saintlier worthy of the two?
Past all dispute, yon anchorite, say you.
Your sentence and mine differ, what’s a name?
I say the Bramin has the fairer claim.
If sufferings Scripture nowhere recommends,
Devised by self to answer selfish ends,
Give saintahip—then all Europe must agree,
Ten starveling hermits suffer less than he.

causing us to suffer for Him ; not satisfying the law for us, but enabling us to satisfy the law for ourselves ?—" Alas ! then, if this be true," replies the Bishop, " we must turn our creeds and hopes and books and homilies and sermons inside out ; old things indeed must pass away, and all things become new."

How this new and strange doctrine—new and strange in the Anglican Church, connects itself with Romanism, the Bishop proceeds with even more than characteristic energy to shew. In what way, he asks, " is a poor sinner, working out his salvation, even to know whether he has peace with God, and may rejoice and hope, or not ? He can have peace, so far only as he is justified. And according to the Oxford doctrine, some are more justified than others : the same person, at various periods, may be in various stages of justification. He asks for the line or mark of justification ; so that, when *beneath* it, he may know that he is not sufficiently justified to have peace with God ; and when *above* it, may know that he is justified enough to have peace with God. No such line is pointed out. Then, whether he is at peace with God, or under His wrath—for there is no medium—he can never know. Where then is the helmet of hope, that strong consolation for him who has fled for refuge to Christ ? The hope that maketh not ashamed, the confidence that when Christ shall appear, he shall be like Him, and shall see Him as He is ?

" Now what is the natural consequence of such a miserable, comfortless doctrine as that, *this feeding us on husks and shells* ? A man, who can never know whether his amount of inherent righteousness is sufficient, will always be excogitating some device or other by which God may be more effectually propitiated and satisfied. In such righteousness there is something that seems tangible, measurable, appreciable. A man can count his penances, measure his pilgrimages, weigh his gifts, and thus keep account of his righteousness, and at last come to account himself sufficiently righteous to be at peace with God. And so there grows out of the mere effort of the troubled conscience to supply the awful uncertainty arising from a scheme of justification which knows nothing better for righteousness than our own works and personal holiness—that whole retinue of our devices for the making a righteousness of our own, and easing the conscience with nostrums of man's quackery, by which the Church of Rome has been for so many centuries so defiled and degraded."

We do not say that the party have gone so far as to recommend the adoption of these devices. They have but prepared the way by the removal of the only security which a sinner could possess, that his peace was made with God. They have taken

away the strong consolation of the gospel, recommending, by implication at least, what they call the "bitterness of the ancient medicine." In place of the faith which enables the justified to "stand in grace, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God," they speak of "the deep and searching agony whereby God, as in a furnace of fire, purifies the whole man by the spirit of judgment, and the spirit of burning;"—the joy of hope, the strong assurance unto the end are thereby repudiated by them as presumption and "ultra-Protestantism. The point at which they have now arrived, the position in which they now stand, was admirably described by a nobleman more distinguished by his talents than by his rank, and by his piety than either—who, when asked his opinion of the Tractarian writers, replied by the citation of a text—"They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."

"From imputed righteousness to inherent," observes the Bishop, "is a great step; but once accomplished, it makes many others easy. It would be a wonderful leap to cross at once from imputed righteousness to purgatory; but the middle ground of inherent once gained, the rest is soon accomplished. From the righteousness of Christ imputed to me, to the righteousness of saints imputed to me, is indeed a great gulf, which no leap of reforming agility would cross at a bound; but the halfway portion of man's righteousness for justification takes half the difficulty away, so that under a sense of one's need of some better righteousness than her own, the leap of the sinner is easy into the midst of the righteousness of the saints, living and dead, deposited under the keys of St. Peter, for the convenience of the Church, and *the benefit of the system of indulgences.*"—(p. 105.)

We directed attention, in our last number, to one of those artifices employed by Mr. Newman in the preparation of his argument, which reminded us involuntarily of the "depths of Satan, as they speak;"—the statement of what all will admit to be true, and the inference and insinuation from it of what many would repudiate as false. We are reminded of this by the allusion to the system of indulgences. Mr. Newman, illustrating Article xxii in Tract 90, tells us, that "not every doctrine about indulgences, but the Romish only, is a fond thing;" and informs us further, in his first edition, that the "pardons spoken of in the Article are large and reckless indulgences for the penalties of sin obtained on money payments." The insinuation is, that if the indulgences are *not* large or reckless, and are obtained by any other means than money payments—by the dispensing power of the Pope, for example—they are not a "fond thing," nor are they proscribed or denounced by the Article. In his second edition, indeed, (for

which the printer must have provided himself with an extra pound of parentheses) the expressions are greatly modified and mitigated—but the reason of this is clear;—the mining party have been encountered in their galleries by the defenders of the bastion, and have modified the colour of their signal light, counselling delay. We trust indeed that some eyes are already opened, some consciences already startled, some judgments already convinced. There are symptoms of irresolution and insubordination in the camp. Mr. Scwell's trumpet has blown an uncertain sound—and Dr. Hook was in the very act of deserting, when the quaternion of Tutors fired the signal gun, and the Hebdomadal Board poured in a well-directed volley, and he thought it better, on the whole, to stand his ground with the Oxfordists, than to be received with jealous scrutiny and secret suspicion by the Anglicans. One Bishop indeed has volunteered his friendly co-operation—but it is the Bishop of Melipotamus!

We return, however, from this shadowy Prelate, and his Utopian See, to the Bishop who presides over the vast diocese of Ohio—a diocese equalling England in extent—and we hope Mr. Newman's reverence for the episcopal office will not be impaired, because, instead of the mere nomination of the Pope, Bishop M'Ilvaine has been called to his high functions, after the primitive pattern, by the suffrage of the majority of the members of the Church in the diocese, and the consent of the greater part of the House of Bishops. In this respect at least the "last has become first." The American Bishop can neither be the tool of the dominant political party, nor the satellite of a foreign and despotic hierarch—the "inferior clergy" are not insulted, as in England, by the mockery of an election, nor commanded, as within the Roman jurisdiction, to receive a master who is himself a slave. The notion of the "fellow-elder," the *primus inter pares*, seems to be more accurately realized among them than in any nation of the earth; and accordingly, since the revival of episcopacy in America, more bishops in proportion have been produced who were vigilant guardians of the fold, and examples to the flock, than in any other section of the Church of Christ. We might mention many names in proof of our assertion, to which now may be added that of M'Ilvaine—but we proceed with the work under review, in the fourth chapter of which the Bishop compares the doctrine of Oxfordism, as to the righteousness of justification, with that of the schoolmen;—in the fifth with that of the Council of Trent;—in the sixth with that of the Romish Church—in each case stating his propositions, and proceeding to the demonstration of them with the utmost precision and exactness. We should be glad to accompany the able writer

step by step ; but since the limits within which we are confined must necessarily render this impracticable, we will content ourselves with taking the last of the three, which virtually implies the other two. The first proposition in which the Oxfordists agree with the Romish and disagree with the Anglican Church is this—that faith before baptism is not, and cannot be, a living faith, that which worketh by love.

“Faith,” says Mr. Newman, “as gaining its virtue from Baptism, is one thing before that sacred ordinance, another after.”

The view of the Anglican Church is, that Baptism gains its virtue (in adults) from faith ; for the pre-requisites to baptism are, “repentance, whereby we forsake sin ; and faith, whereby we believe the promises of God made to us in that sacrament.”

Mr. Newman's distinction is not that of the Scriptures, but of Aquinas, who terms faith before baptism *fides informis*, dead faith ; and faith after baptism *fides formata*, or lively faith. Before baptism, faith is without availing power, without life in the sight of God as regards justification. Hence

2. Faith before baptism is said to justify, or to be an instrument of justification, only as a necessary preparation for, and that which leads to, baptism.

“What does the Scripture say of faith before baptism,” asks Mr. Newman, “except as a necessary step to baptism ? Its highest praise before baptism is, that it leads to it ; as its highest efficacy after is, that it comes from it. Faith does not precede justification, but justification precedes faith and makes it justifying, so that the faith required for baptism is not faith.”

Would Mr. Newman say that the repentance required for baptism is not repentance ? The Anglican Church places both of these pre-requisites on the same footing—and, while she has the authority of him who said, “Repent ye, and believe the gospel,” we do not see how it is possible to dispense with the second, without in the same manner and to the same extent, dispensing with the first.

“It is the essence of sectarian doctrine,” however, says Dr. Pusey, “to consider faith, and not the sacraments, as the proper instrument of justification and other gospel gifts, instead of holding that the grace of Christ comes to us altogether from without.”

Now, in order to expose the fallacy of this, let us go back in imagination some seventeen centuries to the age of Domitian. Eubulus, a noble Roman, is present for the first time at a meeting of Christians, held before dawn of day. He hears them sing an hymn, and unite in praise to God. An old man, bowed with years, but the fire of his eye undimmed, addresses the assembly. The heart of Eubulus is opened—he attends to the things spoken

of John—his eyes are uncurtained—he sees wondrous things—he is not only almost but altogether persuaded to be a Christian—he is just about to utter the words, “I believe.” But the emissaries of the tyrant have tracked to their covert the disciples of the cross. They are seized—dragged before the proconsul—condemned—John is banished to Patmos, Eubulus to Scythia. His guards dread the rigours of the inhospitable climate—they conspire against his life—pierced by many swords, he dies, believing but not baptized. Is he the victim of man, or the martyr of Christ? Is he justified by faith, or not justified through lack of baptism? “The latter,” says Dr. Pusey. “We are saved by faith bringing us to baptism, and by baptism God saves us.” But faith did not bring Eubulus to baptism—therefore he was not saved.

But, without going back seventeen centuries, or even as many years, might not something like this have occurred, if not in Bp. M’Ilvaine’s diocese of Ohio, at least in one more to the south? Might not a slave, secretly and stealthily, hear, if not an Apostle, yet one who treads in his steps, a Missionary? Might not his heart be opened, by the same power which unsealed that of Onesimus? Might he not be discovered in the act, cast into the dungeon, branded, scourged, poisoned by cotton-seed in South Carolina, or worked to death by the merciful law of Louisiana, which allows the slave two-and-half hours in the twenty-four for rest, without any opportunity of receiving the holy sacrament of baptism? Might he not be sustained under all his sufferings and tortures by the “faithful saying, and worthy of all men to be believed, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners?” Might not faith be counted to him for righteousness—working not, indeed, but believing in him that justifieth the ungodly? “No,” replies Mr. Newman, “this is only a *fides informis*—the faith preparatory to baptism, and the faith required for baptism is not faith?”

But the Church of England, we think, would return a different reply. With her the sacraments are regarded “as GENERALLY necessary to salvation”—the terms of the rule implying the possibility of exception. And why? Because, as she differs from the Oxford School in discriminating between justification and sanctification; the one, wrought by Christ, perfect, though not inherent—the other, wrought in man, inherent though not perfect—so she differs from them in admitting but one kind of faith—that which precedes baptism, prepares for baptism, effectuates baptism, follows baptism, consummates baptism—the faith which justifies, from the moment of its production in the heart by the Spirit of God, because it lays firm hold on pre-existing grace—and “by grace ye are saved, through faith.”

Faith, however, instead of being in any sense an instrument of justification *in* (much less *before*) baptism, is itself first justified, made regenerate, and living, by baptism, "for," says Mr. Newman, "faith being the appointed representative of baptism, derives its virtue and authority from that which it represents. It is justifying, because of baptism. It is the true faith of the baptised; of the regenerate; that is, of the justified. Faith does not precede justification, but justification precedes it, and makes it justifying. Baptism is the primary instrument, and creates faith to be what it is, and otherwise is not, giving it power and rank, and constituting it as its own (baptism's?) successor. Each has its own office, Baptism at the time, faith ever after—the sacraments, the instrumental, faith the sustaining cause!"

And what then is before baptism? What induces the desire? What prompted the enquiry, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptised?" Assuredly, Philip the Evangelist had some notion of a pre-existing, pre-disposing faith, for he replied, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Was the Eunuch justified, when he answered, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" Did baptism, not yet administered, create this faith that went before it—or was it in reality no faith at all? What power and rank did baptism give this faith, which it had not before? What did baptism make it, that otherwise it was not, being already a belief with all the heart?

If, however, faith before baptism is thus vague, indeterminate, a mere moral instinct, not a virtue or a grace—what is it, according to this anti-Anglican system, when regenerate and justified in baptism? Is it such a trust in the divine mercy as apprehends, embraces, or lays hold on, the righteousness of Christ for the remission of sins, and thus justifies the soul before God? Alas, no! "It would seem," says Mr. Newman, "that Luther's doctrine, now so popular, that justifying faith *is* trust, comes first, justifies by itself, and then gives birth to all graces, is not tenable: such a faith cannot be, and if it could, would not justify."—WHY NOT? "This," says Hooker, "is the only hand which putteth on Christ for justification." Bishop Andrews says, "By faith Abraham took hold of Christ, and that faith was counted to him for righteousness, and to us shall be, if we be, in like sort, apprehensive of him," and again. "As from the Brazen Serpent, no virtue issued to heal but for them that *steadily beheld it*, so neither doth there from Christ, but upon those that with the eye of faith have their contemplation on this object, who hereby draw life from Him." Mr. Newman, however, speaks contemptuously of those weak-minded persons, who "because the Brazen Serpent healed by being looked at, consider

that Christ's sacrifice saves by the mind's contemplating it. "This is what they call casting themselves upon Christ, coming before him simply, and without self trust, and being saved by faith."—Undoubtedly it is—to this grave charge they plead guilty—nor have they any thing better to advance in extenuation of the practice, but the example and exhortation of one, who "looked unto Jesus as the Author and Finisher of his faith.

Lastly. Faith, according to this system, "only continues and sustains the justification or infusion of righteousness received in baptism, not in any proper sense as an instrument applying to itself the righteousness of Christ, but only as joined with all other Christian virtues and works." "Justification," says Dr. Pusey, "comes through the sacraments; is renewed by faith, and lives in obedience." "Justification," echoes Mr. Newman, "needs a perpetual instrument, such as faith can, and baptism cannot be." The Sacraments are the immediate, faith is the secondary, subordinate, or representative instrument of justification; or we may say, varying our mode of expression, that the sacraments are its instrumental, and faith its sustaining cause." Thus we get to the point. Faith is only representatively justifying—only as it acts in the name, by the authority, and as the instrument or servant of baptism, and thus sustaining what baptism begun; so that on the principle, *qui fecit per alium facit per se*, it is only baptism justifying still.

Among the many misapprehensions of which we have been guilty during a great period of our lives, and to which our eyes are at last to be opened by the new light from Oxford, one is, that we have ever regarded the Apostle Paul, though the least in his own eyes, as one in whom the "signs of an Apostle were eminently displayed—one who laboured more abundantly than any, and who, in his ministry and apostleship, was not a whit behind the very chiefest of them all." We find, however, that Paul was not commissioned to minister the immediate, but only the secondary, subordinate, and representative, instrument of justification. "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel"—and though his speech and his preaching among the Corinthians was with demonstration of the spirit and of power, he was directly instrumental to the justification of none but Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanus—and, strange to say, he thanks God on this very account. It will not be doubted, that these persons were baptised, for they were "sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints"—yet Paul, giving himself to the inferior office of ministering the word, delegated to others the superior ordinance of baptism—his object was, that "their faith should stand, not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God." But he must have laboured under some

strange hallucination as to the real character of faith, by which, and not by baptism, he tells the Romans that a man is justified—nay, “justified even without the works of the law ;—the Galatians, that “they are the children of God,” not by baptism, but by “faith in Christ Jesus,” though he alludes to baptism in the very next sentence ;—and John must have fallen into the very same error, when he asks, Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?—an error, which our Church has faithfully copied when she affirms that faith is, by baptism not communicated, but “confirmed”—grace not originated, but “increased, by virtue of prayer”—promises, not primarily applied and made available, but “visibly signed and sealed.” Now we hesitate not to maintain, that this single expression “CONFIRM” is decisive as to the anti-Anglicanism of these Oxford doctrines—these directions of the “movement in defence of Church principles.” The word implies the very reverse of alteration, or modification—it is, simply, to continue and maintain the thing spoken of in its already existing state. “But faith required for baptism is not faith,” argues Mr. Newman? What then, we rejoin, can be the advantage of “CONFIRMING” it?

But we must allow Bishop M'Ilvaine to speak for himself—as to another consequence arising naturally and necessarily too out of these anti-Anglican and anti-scriptural views of the nature, office, and character of faith. We have endeavoured to shew that faith, under peculiar circumstances, might avail to justification without baptism, even though the Sacrament itself is “generally necessary to salvation.” The opposite supposition of baptism without faith is touched upon in the following extract :—

“Now here arises a very grave question for this system to answer. According to Dr. Pusey and this school, in full agreement with the Church of Rome on this head, what they call sin after baptism, or mortal sin, necessarily destroys the virtue of baptism, removes its justification, makes it unjustification. Faith, then, has lost its power to sustain what baptism gave, can no more act as its representative, because it is now dead again, by sin, and needs again to be raised, regenerated, and justified before it can be in a condition to be an instrument in any way of justification. Such Dr. Pusey supposes may have been the case of Simon Magus. In his zeal to support the *opus operatum* of baptism, in every case in which the recipient may not be supposed to have been an infidel or a hypocrite, he supposes that Simon may have been indeed *regenerated and justified* in his baptism, though, so soon afterwards, he was declared by St. Peter to be “in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity.” But only his faith did not sustain his justification ; it proved an *unfaithful representative*, is the explanation.

“Now the question is, how, in the case of sin after baptism, which is no other than the universal case of those who have been baptized in infancy, *how is justification to be renewed?*”

“The answer must be, *not by faith*, for that, by the supposition, is now

dead again, and incapable of acting as the representative of baptism. And baptism cannot be repeated. So that faith has no hope. Some other way must be ascertained, if possible, for the renewal of justification.

"Mr. Newman meets the difficulty by making both sacraments instruments of justification. Thus sin after baptism is remitted in the Eucharist. But here is the difficulty in such a scheme: How is the poor sinner to come to the Eucharist? By faith, of course. But, alas, his faith is now dead, and there is no more baptism to revive it—so that if he comes to the Lord's Supper, and does truly and spiritually receive the body and blood of Christ to his soul's health—to his justification, it must be with a *dead* faith, such as, according to Mr. N., is not even necessarily a moral virtue, has no moral excellence, any more than the devil's faith. From this result there is no escape. But possibly Mr. N. does not desire an escape; for why is a *dead* faith any the less meet preparation for the Lord's Supper than for baptism, when in both we receive the body and blood of Christ, *by putting on Christ* in one, and *feeding on him* in the other? It is sufficiently revolting as to either. But what more revolting than "*to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and apparently insensible?*" And yet, say the Oxford Tracts, "*neither practice is without the sanction of primitive usage*"—of course, then, not without the sanction of Oxford divinity, for the primitive usage is its law. Then if these gentlemen are prepared to give the Eucharist to infants and the insensible, it is probably no objection in Mr. Newman's view to a system, that it requires, in certain cases, that the same be administered to a dead faith. Mr. Palmer, however, though of this school, seems not to be quite ready for such an extreme, and yet cannot very positively go against it. On the question, whether those who have not a living faith can receive the Eucharist to their soul's health, he cautiously remarks, that, since we read in the Scriptures, "*he that eateth my flesh, &c., hath everlasting life,*" therefore the Church regards it as *the more pious and probable opinion*, that those who are totally devoid of *true and lively faith* do not partake of the holy flesh of Christ in the Eucharist, God withdrawing from them so divine a gift." This, indeed, is a most singularly moderate opinion. But it cuts off Mr. Newman's mode of escape from the difficulty in which sin after baptism involves the system. It forbids the use of the Eucharist as a justifying ordinance, in the case of one whose faith by such sin has relapsed into death.

"Now the necessity of this Dr. Pusey understands; so that *he* does not pretend that the Eucharist can justify in such a case, nor does he at all shrink from the consequence; but, more boldly carrying out the system to its results, than Mr. Newman seems ready for, he freely, and in several places acknowledges, as well in the Tracts as in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, that 'there are but two periods of absolute cleansing—baptism, and the day of judgment;' and as the Church '*has no second baptism to give,*' so in the case of the sinner supposed, '*she cannot pronounce him altogether free from his past sins*—she therefore teaches him continually to repent, that so his sins *may* be blotted out, though she has no commission to tell him absolutely that they *are*.'

"Thus Dr. Pusey has no way of justification in this life for sin after baptism, though Mr. Newman thinks *he* has, in the Eucharist—unless, however, we are mistaken in his use of words, when he calls the Eucharist a *justifying* sacrament. He may mean, with the Romanist, only that it takes away *venial* sins—not *mortal*.

"Now let us see how Romanism surmounts the difficulty. According to the system of Rome and that of Oxford, sin after baptism destroys justification, and makes a living faith to be *dead*. The doctrine of Rome agrees with Dr. Pusey in denying that justification from such sin can be obtained in the Eucharist, on the ground that he who is spiritually dead ought not to receive that spiritual food which is only for the living, and cannot be united to Christ. Still, however, the Eucharist is called in Romish language a justifying sacrament, as is also Extreme Unction; and as sprinkling with holy

water, and the episcopal benediction, are called in Romish divinity justifying ordinances; but their efficacy is only for the remission of *venial* sins, such as the Church of Rome says '*have not properly the nature of sin.*'

"How, then, does the Church of Rome provide for sin after baptism? She invents a sacrament for its remission, viz. that of *penance*, which consists of contrition, confession, and satisfaction, with the absolution of the priest. Without this, it is absolutely unpardonable. The tendency of the Oxford system to the same contrivance will be more manifest by and by."—(pp. 204—208.)

Chapter VII. compares the doctrine of Oxford divinity, as to the office and efficacy of baptism, with that of the Romish Church, and proves to demonstration, that the *opus operatum* of baptism is held alike by both. Both keep out of view the truth, enunciated by the article of our church, that the sacraments are signs—both exalt human agency and proportionably disparage divine influence by identifying the visible sign with the invisible grace. This expression, *opus operatum*, requires to be explained. In the scholastic language of Romanism, there are two technical expressions with regard to the efficacy of the sacraments—viz., *opus operans*, and *opus operatum*. The expression that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operante* means that their efficacy requires in the recipient a preparatory state of inward piety—but the *opus operatum* is simply the efficacy of the sacraments without respect to the state of the recipient, except that he do not shut up his soul against them. This does not mean, that in the adult recipient of baptism *no* faith is required, but that it need not be a *living faith*. It may be only such faith as the devils, who believe and tremble, possess as well as we. The baptized person, according to the Oxford scheme, is made righteous by baptism, from being, up to the time of baptism, unrighteous. A living faith, working by love, is begotten in baptism, and is expressly said, not to precede but to follow it. What further evidence can be needed than this, that in the *opus operatum* of baptism, the two schemes of Oxford and Rome are one?

But this notion is as diametrically opposed to the Anglican, as it is accordant with the Romish scheme. "Baptism," says our xxvii. article, is a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church. "Baptism," says Dr. Pusey, "*is not a sign, but the putting on of Christ—a thing, most powerful and efficacious.*" In other words, baptism, instead of being the "sign of regeneration," is regeneration itself.

But, further, if baptism be justification, and justification be progressive, variable, and therefore imperfect, what is to become of those who fall into sin after baptism and thus impair and invalidate their justification,—i. e. of the vast majority of the human

race—nay, of the human race itself, for where is the just man upon earth, who doeth good, and sinneth not?—"As God has chosen men," answers the Romanist, "to be his instruments and agents in purifying his creatures from original and actual sin, by the spiritual regeneration of baptism, so has He likewise commissioned men to pardon and restore those to grace who might afterwards relapse. He has instituted for the latter a form of repentance; a tribunal of confession and penance. "No individual can obtain the remission of sins, after baptism, without submitting to penance, either in effect or decree. Jesus Christ has instituted the sacrament of penance for the ordinary remission of all sin committed after baptism."—p. 247.

Dr. Pusey has not yet, so far as it appears, recognized penance as a sacrament; but he is brought into the precise difficulty for which this sacrament of penance was invented. "The Church," he says, "has no second baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce the penitent altogether free from past sins. There are but two periods of absolute cleansing—baptism, and the day of judgment."

How does he know this? How does he know that it was not a period of "absolute cleansing" to the Corinthian offender when the sentence of excommunication was taken off, and the Church was enjoined to receive him, and comfort him—lest such an one be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow?

How does he know this? "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins."—Our Church addresses this especially to her communicants—does she mean them to infer, that the propitiation, after all, is inadequate, and that they are not, after frank confession and true contrition, absolutely cleansed?

But, says the Article, "not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is unpardonable;—wherefore they are to be condemned that deny the place of forgiveness to such as freely repent."

Is Dr. Pusey then condemned by the Article? "No," he will reply—"he does not deny it—he only doubts the possibility of *true* repentance." And this is the language in which he has expressed his doubt;—

"Who truly repent; when a man who has been guilty of sin after baptism may be satisfied that he is truly repentant for it; whether and to what degree he should all his life continue his repentance for it; wherein his penitence should consist; whether continued repentance would efface the traces of sin in himself; whether he might even in this life look upon himself as restored to the state in which he had been had he not committed it; whether it affect the degree of his future bliss, or its effects be effaced by repent-

ance ; but their extinction depends upon the continued greatness of his repentance ; whether cessation of his active repentance may not bring back degrees of the sin upon him ; whether it shall appear again in the day of judgment ; these and the like are questions upon which the article does not speak."

But wherefore not ? Because the article recognizes a higher authority than itself, which has already settled these and a thousand similar questions in one short sentence, " Whoso covereth his sins shall not prosper, but he that confesseth and forsaketh them shall find mercy." They truly repent who utterly renounce their sin.

But Dr. Pusey's questions, as Bishop M'Ilvaine has shown, have not even the merit of being original :—

" A few specimens of questions proposed and answered at large in the *Summa* of Aquinas, the great *thesaurus* of the divinity of Trent, placed in contrast with those of Dr. Pusey, will show whither the latter has been seeking for aid.

" Dr. Pusey asks, ' whether a man should all his life continue his repentance' for sin after baptism—' whether cessation of his *active* repentance (penance) may not bring back degrees of the sin upon him ?' Aquinas asks, *Utrum tota hæc vita sit contritionis tempus*—whether the whole of this life is the time for such repentance ?

" Whoever understands the gospel, as to the nature of godly sorrow, will say *yes* ; we are to be penitents, of a contrite heart, for *all* sin, unto death. But the answer is not so easy to those who make Dr. Pusey's distinction between *active* repentance and *passive*—the former meaning *the doing of penance*, for the remission of sins.

" Again Dr. P. asks, whether he who truly repents for sin after baptism ' be altogether pardoned ; or whether only so long as he continue in a state of penitence ?' Aquinas also asks—*Utrum peccata dimissa redeant per sequens peccatum*—whether sins remitted may return by subsequent sin—which is the same thing as to ask whether they be *altogether* remitted. Dupin cites ' the Master of the Sentences' as treating the same question, vol. ix. p. 198.

" Again, Dr. Pusey asks, ' whether continued repentance would efface the traces of sin in himself ?' Aquinas—*Utrum remissa culpa mortali, tollantur omnes reliquæ peccati*—whether when the guilt of mortal sin is remitted, all traces of the sin are effaced ?

" Again Dr. Pusey, ' whether one might ever in this life look upon himself as restored to the state in which he had been, had he not committed it ?' Aquinas—*Utrum post pœnitentiam resurgat homo in equali virtute*—whether after penance, the man attains the same virtue he had before—*Utrum per pœnitentiam restituitur homo in pristinam dignitatem*—whether after penance a man is restored to his former dignity ?

" Again, in Tract No. 76, it is stated to be a question among the Oxford writers, whether ' the change in the soul made by baptism is indelible for good or for evil ?' Aquinas asks, *Utrum character insit animæ indelibiliter*. What is here called *character*, and which is conferred only in baptism, according to Romanism, is *in anima sicut quædam virtus instrumentalis et importat quandam potentiam spiritualem*. The questions of the Tract and the Schoolman are precisely alike.

" Again, Dr. Pusey, ' whether it (sin after baptism repented of) affect the degree of his future bliss—whether it shall appear again in the day of judgment ?' Aquinas—*Utrum remissa culpa per pœnitentiam remaneat reatus pœnæ*—whether the guilt being remitted, by penance, there remains any liability to penalty ? The answer of Aquinas to this, is that although by

virtue of penance the guilt is remitted, and with it *eternal* punishment, nevertheless there may remain a liability to punishment of a temporal kind—in other words, *purgatory*. And this is precisely that ‘double state,’ viz. that of one’s person being ‘accepted,’ but his having sins yet ‘*uncancelled*,’ after death, till the day of judgment, in which, Dr. Pusey says, the divinity of Oxford agrees with the Romanists, and which he asserts is plainly revealed in the Scriptures.

“Blessed be God, who has spared us such bondage, and showed unto us a more excellent way—even that ‘new and living way,’ whereby we have ‘boldness of access’ to his mercy-seat, and are ‘brought nigh by the blood of Christ,’ and are commanded to ‘draw near with full assurance of faith,’ and to rejoice in the certainty that ‘the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from *all* sin,’ so that nothing can separate us from his love.”—(pp. 256—259.)

Such is a specimen of the manner in which the Bishop of Ohio makes good his charges against Oxfordism—such the accuracy with which he gauges the depth of their broken cisterns, and proves that they will hold no water. The remaining chapters in no respect derogate from the character and ability of those which have preceded them—they establish the negative proposition, that Oxfordism is NOT Anglicanism, as conclusively as the foregoing have established the affirmative, that Oxfordism is Romanism—only a little diluted, a little disguised—shorn of a few among its more gross and glaring extravagances, but retaining enough to identify it clearly with the “Man of Sin.”—The concluding observations contain a dialogue between an anxious enquirer who has committed sin after baptism, and the “master” of the Oxford Divines, which we should be glad to see reprinted in the form of a separate Tract, as it proves in a popular manner that these views, instead of carrying out the main principle of the gospel, in leading sinners to repentance, have a tendency rather to drive even penitents to despair!

We cannot conclude without expressing our sense of deep obligation to the able and pious author of this valuable work, who has indeed proved himself no negligent or unfaithful guardian of the Church of Christ—whose ability in unmasking error is only exceeded by his fidelity in declaring truth. The office for the consecration of bishops, except as to that part which refers to the civil authority, is, we believe, the same in the American as in the Anglican Church—and assuredly Bishop M’Ilvaine has faithfully “exercised himself in the Holy Scriptures, and called upon God by prayer, for the true understanding of the same, so that he is enabled by them to teach and exhort with wholesome doctrine, and and to withstand and convince the gainsayers.” Assuredly he has “shewn himself ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God’s word, and both privately and OPENLY to call upon and encourage

others to do the same." We could wish that the same task had been similarly performed on our own side of the Atlantic—that among those who are the overseers of God's heritage among ourselves, some one had been found, who would have added the weight of high station and influence to the combined power of talent and of learning, in defending the fundamental principles of our Church against the "enemies of her own house." When foundations are threatened, it is possible to be silent too long. Evil is the day of warfare, when even the standard-bearer fainteth. The absence of remonstrance and reproof may be misconstrued into compromise, connivance, or even acquiescence. But if the task be not performed altogether in so popular a mode as we would have wished it, we rejoice that it is done, and done well—and while we congratulate the American Church as possessing such a prelate as Bishop M'Ilvaine, we claim a portion in him ourselves, as a Bishop of the Church of Christ—as a guardian and defender of the common faith !

THE CONTINUOUS HISTORY OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. J. TATE, A.M., Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's. London : *Longman.* 1841.

THE history of St. Paul—what a stirring thought to the Christian ! How it carries us over the gulf of centuries to the early days of the Church—to the times really primitive, when Christian doctrine came forth in its heavenly purity, fresh from the living fountain of the Divine Spirit ! And if, when we look at the corruptions which have since defiled the Church, we have cause, like the Apostle, for weeping and tears ; yet, when we trace its triumphant spread, and its past victories in almost every land, we have cause, like him, to thank God and take courage.

Mr. Tate, who is already known to the public by his classical labours, meets us here on higher and holier ground. No subject could be more appropriate to a Canon of St. Paul's than the one which he has here chosen as his first main contribution to our theological treasury. Would that the spirit of that great Apostle might animate and possess not only the clergy who are connected with that noble pile, but the multitudes who are daily thronging around it, heedless of the thrilling memories which it ought to awaken in every Christian heart ! A brighter scene than our eyes have yet witnessed would then open upon our sinful world.

The present work is designed by the Author as a supplement, or perhaps we should say as an introduction, to the *Horæ Paulinæ* of Dr. Paley, which forms the second part of the volume. The other part is a continuous history of the Apostle, drawn from the Acts, but with references to the Epistles interwoven. To these are appended several short but interesting dissertations. It is most refreshing to turn from the petty topics of a day, or the thorny debates of a formal theology, to trace the unwearied steps of this great Apostle in his ministry of love; and we shall gladly devote a few pages to this sacred and delightful employment.

The *Horæ Paulinæ* itself is unquestionably Paley's most valuable work. His Moral Philosophy, we hope, has run its course. It is an odious thing to trick up a refined selfishness in the robes of virtue; and still more to transplant the noisome weed into the heavenly paradise, and then to palm it upon us for the pure amaranth of divine love. We do not wish Cambridge to import formalism and implicit faith along with "Christian Morals" from her sister University; but we trust she will at least abjure the coarse lessons of expediency, and learn to emulate her by a school of Ethics, not less glowing and vigorous, but more scriptural and pure. This would be one of the happiest omens for our highly favoured land.

But to return. Whatever the defects of Paley's other works, the *Horæ Paulinæ* we regard as almost perfect in its kind. All the excellences of the Author's mind there meet with their proper field, and come into full play. There is a transparent clearness, a logical justness, and precision of thought; a pointed simplicity of style, that acts on the reader with a magical power, as if a telescope were applied to the mind's eye, and we were transported suddenly through eighteen centuries, into the very scene of the apostolic labours. To complete this important work of Dr. Paley, by a history of St. Paul, in which its conclusions are embodied and its principles applied, is the useful design of our Author in this volume; and few can read it, we think, without finding their knowledge of the sacred history increased, and their sympathies drawn out more strongly than before to the early Church and the great Apostle of the Gentiles. We can only select a few points for observation as we pass along.

Acts ix. 20, "And straightway he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God;—in other words, the Messiah that was to come." There can be little or no doubt that Griesbach's reading, here adopted by Mr. Tate, is the true one. The name "Christ" is only gradually introduced in the New Testament Scriptures, as a *personal* title of our Lord; never in the Gospels; twice or thrice only, that we remember, in the Acts;

in the Epistles more frequently. This is one of those internal marks of genuineness which multiply on the attentive reader, and one which we do not recollect to have seen mentioned in that light. But the comment which follows appears liable to misconception. Not to refer to "Wilson's Illustrations," where the question is treated at length, the passage (Rom. i. 3, 4) may of itself teach us that the titles "Christ," or "Messiah," and "Son of God," were distinct in meaning in the view of St. Paul. The Sonship of our Lord, in its proper sense, is so cardinal a doctrine of our faith, that we think Mr. Tate will do well to modify or explain the remark in a second edition, and remove the danger of a construction which he does not intend.

Acts ix. 20, "They spake unto the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus." The true reading, "Greeks" (Ἕλληνας), here substituted for "Grecians" (Ἑλληνιστάς), suggests to our Author a remark which may be useful to mere English readers. The term "Grecians" denotes Jews who spoke the Greek language; but "Greeks," in St. John's Gospel, and the early part of Acts, denotes Gentile proselytes, and in other places has its wider and classical meaning.

The first Appendix (ch. xv.) relates to the time of the apostolic journey mentioned in Galatians. The general opinion identifies it with the mission to the council at Jerusalem (xv. 3). Mr. Greswell fixes it later (Acts xviii. 22); while Mr. Tate views it as a private journey, earlier than the council, perhaps by a year.

The view of Mr. Greswell, we think, is plainly erroneous. Not to speak of the presumption that the Epistle itself was written earlier, the history almost excludes the notion that Barnabas was with St. Paul on that visit. Mr. Greswell himself can only account for it, by supposing a distinct revelation to Barnabas, which is very unlikely. Besides, the break in the narrative (Gal. i. ii.) is, on this view, quite unnatural, and would defeat its main scope, which is to prove St. Paul's independence, through his whole previous course, of the other Apostles.

Four reasons are assigned by Mr. Tate for a date *earlier* than the council. One journey was by revelation (Gal. ii. 2), the other by commission (Acts xv. 2). In the one, Barnabas and Titus are the only companions named; in the other, Barnabas and several others. In the first, St. John is present, in the other he is not mentioned. In the Epistle, the object of the journey was to establish St. Paul's apostleship; in Acts, to decide on Gentile observance of the law. To these he adds the dispute with St. Peter, which it seems incongruous to place after the council.

The first of these reasons is hardly conclusive. A revelation to

St. Paul is not inconsistent with a commission, even in consequence of it, by the Church. Titus only might be named, because the Apostle had a reason (ii. 3) for stating his presence. Though St. John is not named in Acts, all the Apostles would seem to have been present at the council (xv. 6); and indeed his absence on such an occasion is hardly credible, since he must have been in the neighbourhood at least of Jerusalem.

Still the journeys seem to be distinct, for the following reasons. First, the dispute with St. Peter could scarcely have occurred just after a council of all the apostles had decided on that very point. Next, the narrative in Acts seems to allow no place for St. Peter's visit to Antioch after the council. It is far more likely, at least, that it was during the "long time," (ch. xiv. 28) than during the "some days," (xv. 36.) Farther, the epistle seems to have been aimed against a perversion of the decree itself, palmed on the Galatians by the Judaizing teachers. St. Paul would naturally reply to this, by unfolding the nature of his connection with the Apostles up to the time when the decree was given. He then argues from principles involved in the decree itself, and almost verbally asserted by St. Peter in his speech at the council (Gal. ii. 15, 16. Acts xv. 9—11). On this view of a previous visit, the whole course of events is harmonious, and St. Peter's journey to Antioch might be naturally suggested by that of St. Paul to Jerusalem; while the rebuke may explain the peculiar boldness and faithfulness of his speech afterward at the council. Besides, from the emphasis placed on the words "those of high esteem," (*οἱ δοκουντες*) it would seem that St. Paul then conferred on the subject with the three chief apostles only.

We come next, in the second appendix, to the date of the Epistle itself, which Mr. Tate assigns to the abode at Corinth (xviii. 4), but earlier than either of those to Thessalonica. No question has given rise to a greater variety of opinions. Theodoret and the subscription date it from Rome; Dr. Mill from Troas (Acts xx. 6); Fabricius and Grotius from Corinth on the second visit, after the Epistle to the Romans; Wall and Witsius, with whom Greswell seems to agree, from Ephesus (xx. 22), before that to the Romans, but after those to the Corinthians; Lardner and Beausobre from Corinth at the first stay; Michaelis from Thessalonica or Philippi, Macknight and others still earlier. Mr. Tate agrees in general with Michaelis, in placing it first of the epistles, but supposes it written soon after the arrival at Corinth.

That the Epistle was written before the second visit to Galatia may be inferred from several reasons. The earnestness of St. Paul to prove his apostleship, which would have been needless at a much later

period; the want of allusions to a second visit; his wonder at their speedy perversion, and the limit of time which bounds his personal narrative, all seem conclusive on this point. Mr. Greswell indeed thinks the words "at the first" (το πρῶτον) imply a second visit. Our Author observes in reply that they would consist with such a fact, if other traces of it could be found, but that no such trace exists. Indeed the manner in which St. Paul alludes to the zealous affection of the Galatians seems to exclude the notion that he had visited them again. But the full explanation of the words (το πρῶτον) must be sought, we conceive, in the previous verse. The Apostle there alludes to his false zeal for the law before his conversion, "be as I am, for I *was* as ye *are*: ye have not injured me at all; and ye know that in weakness of the flesh I preached the gospel to you *at the first* (το πρῶτον)." The term would point out the time as intermediate between that he had just referred to, and the date of his writing.

But there is one strong objection against a date so early as Mr. Tate assigns. The remark, ch. vi. 11, by such an arrangement, loses almost its whole force. It seems clearly implied that the Apostle had written one or more shorter letters, and not in his own hand; and even probable that the Galatians themselves were aware of the fact. Again, it is not likely that the account of the Galatians was received from a casual message, but from a special messenger sent for that purpose. And such a messenger would scarcely be sent before the brethren had rejoined the Apostle at Corinth.

It is highly probable, then, that the Epistle was written from Corinth; but after both those to the Thessalonian church. The messenger who carried the first of these, it is reasonable to think, might be directed to retrace the Apostle's course into Asia, and to enquire into the welfare of the newly-founded churches of Galatia. He would then, after some interval, pass through Thessalonica on his return, and could report to St. Paul the reception of his first letter, and the erroneous impression it had caused, as well as the state of the Galatian believers. The second epistle might then have been written immediately by the hand of an amanuensis, and that to the Galatians soon after with his own hand, when the personal toils of the Apostle would allow. The phrase vi. 11. would thus have its full meaning, and refer to the two shorter epistles which St. Paul had already written, and by another hand.

This date seems confirmed by a close inspection of the sacred history, and yields a reflected light upon the Epistle itself. The churches of Phrygia and Galatia were the first of those newly planted by St. Paul, after the council and the apostolic decree. In the absence of Paul and Barnabas, on their great circuit of

labour, the Judaizing teachers would seize the occasion to renew their efforts, and these churches would be the first to be troubled. The decree was too public and recent for the Galatian converts to remain ignorant of it, even if St. Paul and Silas had not left it among them, as is not unlikely. The aim of these teachers then must have been to wrest it to their own views; and two things might serve them as a handle, that St. Paul was not styled an Apostle in the decree, and that it was addressed only to the Syrian and Cilician believers. They would argue from this that St. Paul was only a secondary teacher, and derived all his authority from the chair of St. Peter; that the decree was a kind of special indulgence for the Syrian Churches; but that the Twelve Apostles and the Jewish Church were the final authority and true standard; and their practice in a zealous observance of the law the safest guide to the Galatians; that St. Paul was an useful pioneer, but that it was reserved for them to perfect (iii. 3) what he had taught them with stammering lips under an "ambiguous formulary"—and to shew them a more excellent way, by a full conformity to the Catholic usage of the Jewish Church. They seem further to have hinted that St. Paul himself, as in the case of Timothy, sometimes preached and practised observance of the Mosaic law. Thus did these Judaizers set the first example of a practice which has found too many followers—that of twisting church-formularies, designed as a safeguard against false doctrines, from their plain scope and design; and making them, by forced and garbled constructions, a shield for the very falsehoods they were meant to destroy.

Such we may infer to have been the course of these teachers from the Epistle itself. The severe and vehement tone of the Apostle shews how enormous the evil was in his view. The train of reasoning that he pursues is thus quite clear. From the nature of his intercourse with the other Apostles up to the time of the council, he proves his own equal authority and divine commission; and then, by a rapid transition, from the common faith and practice of all the Apostles (ii. 15), he shews that the regulation in the decree was not an arbitrary or local enactment, but the mere embodying of the life-giving doctrine of the gospel. The perversion of the case of Timothy he refutes by the history of Titus, and the alleged variety of his own preaching by a reference to the constancy of the Jewish persecutions (v. 11.) The whole tone of the letter exactly corresponds to the date just assigned, when the first message had been brought back to the Apostle after his reaching Corinth, while his prolonged sojourn there would hinder a personal visit to the Galatians,—and when Jewish persecution at Corinth was beginning to arise. Earlier than this the false teachers would

scarcely have had time to spread their influence so widely as it appears to have done at the date of the Epistle.

One or two other coincidences confirm this view. In the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, which we suppose earlier, the Apostle does not prefix his Apostolic title; but he uses it in every later Epistle, except to the Philippians, a church towards which he had a special ground of confidence and affection (Phil. iv. 10—16.) How can the transition be better accounted for than by supposing this Epistle to intervene? Again, after the first planting of the gospel in Pisidia, Lycaonia and Pamphylia, the disputes about the law came in, and the Apostle, after a journey to Jerusalem, and obtaining the decree, went through the same parts confirming and establishing the churches (xv. 41, xvi. 5.) Exactly similar, on the above supposition, was his conduct towards the Galatian churches. They are planted at his first visit; (xvi. 6) then Judaizers creep in and disturb their peace; the Apostle writes this Epistle of severe reproof upon the first tidings; and after they were partly restored by its wholesome admonitions, he went over the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, confirming the disciples. It is perhaps a further presumption in favour of the order we have suggested, that the closing exhortation of the two letters (2 Thess. ii. 13 and Gal. vi. 9) is almost exactly and verbally the same.

But we must leave this interesting Epistle, which we fervently commend to the renewed study of every faithful Churchman and watchful Christian at the present time. We must pass over the third and the fourth appendix, only remarking that this last contains a strong confirmation of the later date of the first to Timothy, after St. Paul's first imprisonment. The fifth relates to St. Luke, and contains suggestions on the place and time of his two great works. Mr. Tate supposes both written at Cæsarea; the gospel during the time of St. Paul's detention by Felix, and the Acts during the close of the Apostle's first imprisonment, and after his release, before he was rejoined by the Evangelist in his last journey or in the prison at Rome. The next question, of the journey into Spain, we doubt whether Mr. Tate is justified in deciding so strongly in the negative, without a more precise chronology than he has attempted to establish. On the Epistle to the Hebrews there is an interesting, and so far as we are aware, an original suggestion, that Apollos and Zenas (Tit. iii. 13) were the messengers to whom it was entrusted. That St. Paul is the writer of that Epistle, few simple-minded Christians can doubt. The motive for suppressing his name at the opening is very evident—the inveterate and envenomed hatred of the unbelieving Jews, and the prejudice against him among even many Jewish believers. An

Epistle of such first-rate importance in itself, and which implies on its very face such a strength of adverse prejudice, would seem to require no common messenger. And who more likely to be chosen for this office than Zenas, by profession an expounder of the law, and Apollos, distinguished for eloquence, and mighty in the Scriptures? There is some difficulty, however, attending this hypothesis, which our Author has not attempted to remove. For in this case we must either suppose a long and improbable delay of Zenas and Apollos at Crete, on their way from Rome to Palestine, or place the Epistle to the Hebrews later, and that to Titus earlier than is commonly done. The passage (Heb. xiii. 24) is a strong impediment to this latter view; and since there is no direct evidence connecting Apollos with the Apostle, the conjecture, however interesting at first sight, must be abandoned.

There is another more probable hypothesis upon the date and transmission of this Epistle, which we suggest to Mr. Tate, as better harmonizing than his own with the various notes of time and place, which has further, in our judgment, some indirect support from early tradition. It is well known that the early Church in general, with some few exceptions, referred the Epistle to St. Paul as its author, and viewed it as written to the Jews of Palestine, just before, or soon after, the close of his first imprisonment. There was also, in Origen's time, an impression, less distinct, connecting it with Clemens or St. Luke, as its penman or translator. The genuine Epistle of Clemens, it is further remarkable, contains more allusions to the Epistle to the Hebrews than to any other part of Scripture. Let us suppose the Epistle written from the south of Italy, that Clemens was with the Apostle, and acted as his amanuensis; that the letter was sent privately to St. Luke, then probably, as Mr. Tate has shewn, writing the Acts of the Apostles at Cæsarea; and all the above facts appear to be simply explained. Every one of the suppositions made is also probable in itself, and all the marks of time or place are in full accordance.

With regard to the verse in Titus, from the continuous history itself it appears that St. Paul must have been near Corinth when that Epistle was written. Zenas and Apollos do not seem to have set out when the Apostle wrote, but he must have known of their purpose. They were probably then at Corinth together, where Apollos had been long before in high esteem; and his voyage might be either to Palestine, or to Alexandria, his birth-place (Acts xviii. 24; xxvii. 6, 7). And this suggests naturally one parting observation, full of deep instruction to the Church of Christ, amidst the many divisions of our own day.

Three chief dissensions are mentioned in the sacred history be-

tween the Apostles, or of which they were the occasion—that of Paul and Barnabas about Mark, of Paul and Peter at Antioch, and of the Corinthians on the relative excellence of Paul, Apollos and Cephas. Now it is remarkable that the last Epistle of St. Peter closes with an affectionate reference to St. Paul, as his beloved brother, and with a testimony to the divine wisdom of all his Epistles, including the very record of Paul's rebuke and his own weakness. The last Epistle of St. Paul, in like manner, closes with a special commendation of St. Mark, and a request for his presence, whom he had before rejected as a companion. Does it not complete the beautiful harmony of Christian and Apostolic love, that Apollos, who had been set up as a rival to St. Paul by the Corinthians, is brought before us for the last time as commended by the great Apostle to Titus for his special sympathy and care? And if, as is probable, the message were given from Corinth, where they had already met—the very spot where their names had been the signal for strife and unholy jealousy—what a fresh grace and beauty is given to this third and crowning triumph of Christian love!

With this heavenly example, instructive to every Christian, and of happy omen to the Church at large, we must close our remarks on this interesting volume, which we regard as a valuable accession to our critical theology. We recommend it cordially to all our readers, and especially to every diligent student of the Apostolic Epistles. May the blessing of God rest on every such attempt to increase the acquaintance of the Church with His most holy word!

MEMOIR OF THE REV. C. T. E. RHENIUS, *comprising Extracts from his Journal and Correspondence, with Details of Missionary Proceedings in South India.* By HIS SON. London: Nisbet. 1841.

Most firmly are we persuaded, that if ever the Christian public were favourably predisposed towards a promised publication, it was in the instance now under review. More especially may this be predicated respecting those numerous members of the Establishment who, as supporters of the Church Missionary Society, had long been familiar with the name of Rhenius. It is true that painful circumstances had arisen, or rather that differences of long standing had been brought to a painful issue, towards the close of that missionary's career. It is true, moreover, that, with

regard to the merits of the controversy in question, the verdict of very many would have been unfavourable to the subject of this Memoir. But whilst it may be a faithful representation of the selfish dealings of the *world*, which says,

“ The evil that men do lives after them ;
The good is oft interred with their bones ; ”

with “ the children of light ” it is not so. “ The memory of the just is blessed ; ” and many were the Christians who desired that “ the good ” which Rhenius had been instrumental in effecting, together with the persevering labours by which it was effected, might be recorded in a permanent form. In this kindly feeling we, as individuals, fully participated. Often, in former days, had our ears been gladdened by the recital of those “ good news ” which he was wont to send us “ from a far country.” To the fields which the dying Swartz saw whitening to the harvest, Rhenius seemed called to put in the sickle ; and as the harvest-shout came sweeping over the ocean, it awakened many a joyful echo in our hearts ; “ yea a joyful and a pleasant thing it was ” to read of, and to picture to ourselves those Christian villages of Tinnevelly, the Village of Light, the Village of Love, the Village of Mercy, &c. Emotions such as these are amongst the happiest of which our nature is capable, and it was impossible not to feel grateful to him who had been the instrument in exciting them. It was therefore a regret of no ordinary kind, which we felt on rising from the perusal of this volume, to find that a complete reaction had taken place in our mind.

The truth is, that the author is too inexperienced for a work which required no ordinary delicacy and prudence. He has evidently undertaken it, with the conviction that his primary obligation was to do justice to the memory of his father, by reopening the cause, “ Rhenius v. the Church Missionary Society ; ” and (taking advantage of the solemn and touching circumstances under which he sets forth that cause) to court a public verdict in favour of his revered and beloved client. All this may be very natural—it may originate in feelings which, abstractedly considered, are really praiseworthy. But it destroys the value of the book considered as a legacy to the Church. Admitting even that his father was the oppressed and injured character which it is the drift of this volume to represent him—what benefit, it may be asked, was likely to be derived to the body of Christ by the perpetuation of so unhappy a difference ? It is freely admitted in the narrative that those with whom he differed were Christian men ; and that in the main, though their acts were painful, “ their manner was kind.” Was then the case so strong, the necessity so paramount, that such a

body must still be held up to view, before the indiscriminating part of the public, as little better than tyrants and persecutors? It is moreover confessed, that though the connection betwixt Rhenius and the Church Missionary Society was dissolved in the year 1835, whilst he lived till 1838, the same pension was considerably offered to his widow and family, as though he had continued on the list of recognized missionaries up to the period of his decease. Whilst therefore friends were to be found who could tender to Mrs. Rhenius the judicious advice that she should accept the offer, "lest by refusing it she might give room for the imputation of a churlish *pride*," how lamentable that none of those counsellors, to whom in the preface the son expresses his acknowledgments, should suggest the necessity of caution lest, by an *ex parte* statement of the case, he should render himself obnoxious to the charge of *ingratitude*! Yet once more, proceeding still upon the gratuitous admission that Rhenius was the party aggrieved, what is the scope and tenor of the narrative? Is it, to shew how the servant, feeling that he was "not greater than his master," was unresisting as the victim-lamb, mute "as the sheep before her shearers?" Quite the contrary. The author repeatedly intimates, and evidently triumphs in the intimation, that throughout the controversy his father "was never found at a fault;" in other words, that he possessed a talent for recrimination which rendered him no unequal match for an entire committee. It will be absolutely necessary, before we dismiss the work, to consider this part of its contents a little more particularly. Meanwhile, let us state at this stage the ground on which we have felt it incumbent to raise a warning voice against some of the chief defects in the character which is here portrayed. Here is a volume which claims a place, and that no mean one, on the shelf of missionary biography. It is to take its stand side by side with the memoirs of Swartz, of Martyn, or of Buchanan. It is to be put into the hands of our chaplains and missionaries, as supplying at once a directory and a model. Now we do not hesitate to say, that without some *cautela* to the inexperienced reader, the book is calculated to do no little harm. The reason is, because the author does not understand his subject. Those features which constituted the grand excellences of Mr. Rhenius as a missionary, are the least insisted upon; whilst other scenes and events which, even if the writer's view of them be adopted as correct, were little calculated to exhibit the tempers of the gospel, are perseveringly obtruded. So far, at least, there is a dramatic unity pervading the narrative, the *denouement* of which is, the final rupture with the Society, and a correspondence which even the writer characterizes as severe.

This, alas ! is a drama which human nature is but too ready to re-enact ; and hence we feel that it is a friendly censorship which would seek to abridge such painful scenes.

The outline of Rhenius's biography is sketched in few words. He spent half his life in voluntary exile from his father-land—he laboured for a quarter of a century among the outcast heathen—he lived for them—he died amongst them.

It is a noble history, when reduced to these simple elements ! one on which we should delight to pause, and to glorify God in this his devoted and honoured servant.

But a sterner and more painful task lies before us. The compiler of these memoirs has, in our judgment, “put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter,” and thus laid a necessity upon us to apply a severer but more impartial analysis.

The author admits that his “father's temperament was peculiar.” It would manifestly fall under the class of sanguine. Its excellences alike, and its defects, originated in this complexion, and its lights and shadows were in proportion strongly defined.

That our remarks may be of the most practical kind, we will suppose the book to be in the hands of some young missionary or chaplain, who is intently perusing it on his passage out, and eagerly treading in anticipation the path of enterprise that awaits him. Such a reader would soon discover the remarkable *devotedness* and *disinterestedness* of Rhenius. He had strong ties to his home and country. A widowed mother and kind relatives would gladly have detained him ; but “none of these things moved” him. So, at a subsequent period, when the clouds of difficulty and conflict were gathering thick around him in India, he was earnestly solicited to return to Prussia with the prospect of inheriting considerable substance. But no ! his catechists and converts “were in his heart to live and to die with them.” An *emeritus* missionary was evidently as great an anomaly to his mind, as an *emeritus* apostle. He did not “cast off his first faith.”

A no less prominent characteristic was his *diligence*. See this illustrated in the assiduity with which he applied himself to the acquisition of the Tamul language. Landing at Madras, in July 1814, he conducted a public service in the vulgar tongue, April 1815. Nor was this a single impulsive effort. The whole narrative supplies abundant internal evidence that the following extract is not *mere* encomium :—

“None was ever more diligent than Mr. Rhenius was in those duties which devolved upon him. Indeed they were not duties to him. It was his meat and his drink to do the will of his Maker. In season, and out of season, was he to be found sedulously engaged in something directly useful. His diligence was not occasionally exhibited, nor did it strike by any peculiar zeal

existing only for a season and then waxing cold, but it was steady and uniform. Indeed, but for this quality and the great blessing of general physical health, he could never have produced so many monuments of his zeal and perseverance. Of time he took especial note: and in the regular routine of mission work every department had its particular hour. Except during a few years before his death, he regularly sat up till twelve or one o'clock at night. In the middle of the day he rested for about an hour."—(p. 610.)

As an instance of patient perseverance evinced in a single department of labour, we quote the following passage from one of Rhenius's annual returns to the Committee:—

"We have only to add some special remarks, to prevent any one from thinking more highly of the seminary, or expecting more from it than he ought. These remarks refer to the disadvantages under which it labours. Besides acquiring scriptural knowledge, the higher classes have been studying Tamul, English, Hebrew, Latin, geography, history, European arithmetic, and the elements of logic and rhetoric. But their progress, though steady, is slow, because of the want of elementary books in Tamul. All instruction is communicated in the Tamul language, and a few elementary books are prepared whilst the boys are instructed. The Hebrew has latterly been discontinued, from the want of Hebrew dictionaries. The teacher had always to prepare a vocabulary for each lesson, which, in his daily accumulating engagements, he found too much for him. And then, as the missionary is sometimes absent from home, or otherwise much engaged with the catechists, particularly for eight days every month, he cannot attend regularly to the seminary. So long, therefore, as the elementary books must be prepared whilst the class is instructed, and so long as there is no fit person constantly to attend to the instruction of the youth, they must be considered to be under great disadvantages. Elementary books, however, are gradually coming forward. A Tamul geography and history are now in the Madras press. An introduction to the Scriptures, on the plan of Bickersteth's Scripture Help, and Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures; and a volume on the evidences of Christianity, also taken from Horne; a Tamul grammar, and Tamul Hebrew grammar, are finished, and preparing for the press. A Tamul logic, according to Watts' excellent work, and an abridgment of rhetoric according to Blair, principally to direct the student in composition, are now in progress. When these shall be finished and printed, the study of them will be more easy and rapid, and some of the elder pupils may take the place of teachers. Each boy will then have a copy in his hand, whereas now he must make himself one with pen and ink on paper, or with an iron pen on palmeira leaves; and, although this may be of some use to him, it certainly retards his progress. They are all fully employed; but they must now do that in two days, which otherwise they might do in one day.

"Making these allowances, we are fully satisfied with the state and progress of the seminary; and if others make the same allowances, they also will be satisfied.

"Moreover, in the present state of the country, our aim with the seminaries is not to make them great astronomers, or expert mathematicians, or profound philologists, (to this neither our talents nor our abilities are adequate;) but to make them generally well-informed men, sound reasoners, able theologians, of whom this country at present stands much in need. Should Providence favour us in accomplishing this object, we shall be glad and thankful, and leave the rest to the next generation."—(pp. 357, 358.)

It would be pleasing in like manner to illustrate those other excellences of character, and they are not a few, which present themselves to the view of the attentive reader of this volume.

The missionary candidate would do well to mark the methodical habits of Rhenius, his perfect mastery of detail, his aptness for the organization of schools, societies, and, we may add, of parishes; for his system of native Christian villages unquestionably contained the rudiments of the parochial system. Then again his talents for illustration, so admirably adapted for the prompt and summary refutation of the countless Brahminical sophistries—and on the other hand, his undaunted and uncompromising courage in his Master's cause, are well worthy of admiration and of imitation. Above all, would we direct the young soldier's notice to that constancy of faith, and buoyancy of hope, which for nearly a quarter of a century seem to have sustained this veteran in fixedness of purpose and untiring perseverance of effort.

With all these painful and discouraging circumstances to check and frustrate the efforts of the Christian ambassador, it will not be a matter of surprise to find that after two and a half years spent at Palamcotta, the first-fruits of the joint labours of Messrs. Rhenius and Schmid consisted of four baptized heathens—two of these moreover being children.

In the entry which records their admission into the church, Rhenius adds the ejaculation, "May they be followed by thousands!" To those who have given their attention to the history of this mission, it will be matter of notoriety how *abundantly* this prayer was answered. But possibly even these may have forgotten how *speedy* was the answer. At an interval of only three years we find the exclamation, "To my own surprise, there are now in no less than ninety different villages, 838 families or above 3000 souls." Four years later the number of baptized converts is stated to be 984, and that of all those under Christian instruction to be above 6000. Thus the Churches continued to increase and multiply, till, at the period when Rhenius ceased to be a labourer of the Church Missionary Society, the different congregations amounted, if we remember rightly, to between 9000 and 10000! It cannot be denied that he was permitted, in very many instances, to reap what others had sown, but neither can it be denied that he *did* reap.

We have hitherto viewed only the general features of the narrative, and such as presented a developement of Rhenius's missionary talents and success. We have done so with all honesty, and have felt a real pleasure in attempting to animate the young candidate by the exhibition of that which is at once exemplary and encouraging.

There remains a duty no less important or salutary, though far less gratifying to the Christian reviewer.

The Missionary's is a peculiar office, requiring for its adequate discharge, peculiar gifts and graces, and a supereminent display of the

spirit and temper of the gospel. "The meekness and gentleness of Christ," "the lowliness of mind" which leads the disciples of Christ to "esteem others better than themselves," to "condescend to men of low estate," "in honour to prefer one another," "submitting themselves one to another in the fear of God," and especially if "younger, submitting themselves unto the elder," these are the missionary's essential attributes, these his "ornaments of grace." If he altogether "lack these things," though he might "speak" with the zeal of an apostle, "with the tongue of an angel," or with all the "enticing words which man's wisdom teacheth,"—he would be no better than sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

Tried then by this standard, unquestionably the most arduous to which even regenerate human nature can be submitted, the character of Rhenius falls grievously short. To assert in absolute terms, that the graces thus adverted to were not "in" him, would be not only to judge" but to condemn "another man's servant," as a false professor. Nothing can be farther from our intention, nothing more contrary to our conviction. We only maintain, on the evidence of these memoirs, that such dispositions could not be said to "abound" in him who is their subject. Emphatically do we profess that our verdict is derived from the testimony now before us, and from no other source. We were never brought into contact with a single individual, either official or unconnected with the Church Missionary Society, who from a personal acquaintance with Rhenius has offered so much as a passing opinion on his character; yet with such documents as are now before us, there seems scarcely any room even for a misgiving that we now pronounce an erroneous, or even a harsh sentence. The same sanguine complexion of mind which, as we have seen, was overruled to the accomplishment of much that was great and good, for want of being sufficiently under the control of God's subduing, softening, modelling grace, manifested itself in infirmities and inconsistencies, which Christian faithfulness, and we trust a love unfeigned for the grand work of evangelization, constrain us to point out as the beacons of this biography.

The one grand failing into which, if we mistake not, most of Rhenius's defects, both of manner and of spirit may be resolved, was an exorbitant self-esteem. This rendered him at once arbitrary and insubordinate; self-willed and impatient of opposition, not over-considerate of the feelings of others, yet sufficiently irritable under personal provocation; positive in stating his opinions, pertinacious in maintaining them; absolute among his equals, and, except when implicitly obeyed, harsh towards his

inferiors; violent in his prejudices against every system but his own; eager for the overthrow of all established forms, and specially officious to decry and to correct existing ecclesiastical institutions. Like Baxter indeed we frequently find him a rampant advocate for peace, but like Baxter, he always insisted that it should be peace on his own terms. But, perhaps, the most serious blemish in a moral point of view, was an obliquity of judgment, (when the accomplishment or vindication of his own measures was concerned,) which not unfrequently resembled absolute disingenuousness, or as it was strongly, though in point of fact not unwarrantably implied, a want of "common honesty."

In justice to ourselves, no less than to the character against which these exceptions have been taken, it will be requisite to point out here and there an illustration of their correctness. It is matter of notoriety, that Rhenius cultivated the Tamul language with eminent success; but it is surely characteristic at once of his self-confidence and of his reforming "cacoethes," that when, after a residence of only *sixteen* months in India, he was requested to revise Fabricius's version of the scriptures, he should virtually pronounce it incorrigible, and forthwith commence a translation of his own!

Another and a more amusing sample of the same kind is the following. About four years after his arrival at Madras, Rhenius had forwarded to "the good king of Prussia," Frederic William III., a brief account of missionary operations in Southern India, together with copies of the New Testament in the Tamul and Telugu languages. These were graciously accepted by the monarch, who returned a kind answer to the despatch, and transmitted a medal to the author, "as a memento" of himself. So far all was well. The measures adopted by either party were severally worthy of them. Emboldened, as it might seem, by this condescension, our Missionary at a subsequent date ventured on a further communication to his sovereign. The occasion was on this wise. Frederick was at that time anxious to unite the two Protestant churches, the Lutheran and the Calvinistic, which were established within his dominions. Here as in every case of the kind formidable difficulties presented themselves;—but even for these Rhenius flattered himself that he understood the remedy, and considerately tendered his counsels to "the good old king," accompanied by a letter from which the following is an extract:—

"The form of outward service is not without its importance to every Christian community, especially at a time when infidelity is so widely extending itself. Actuated by this consideration, I have endeavoured, *from my acquaintance with the English (episcopal)* and other ecclesiastical institutions,

to put together some thoughts on the subject, which I herewith lay before your Majesty, humbly requesting they may be taken under your gracious consideration."—(p. 246)

As the narrative affords no further record on the subject, it appears at least problematical whether Frederick recognized the missionary in his new capacity of privy councillor, or forwarded a second medal in acknowledgment of his advice.

Every attentive reader of the documents connected with the planting of the primitive Churches, must have been struck with such expressions as these. "Yourselves, brethren, know that we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children." "To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak." "The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, *patient*, in *meekness* instructing those that oppose themselves."

There can be no question as to the style and *temper* of ministry which such passages exhibit "for our learning." We ask then, is the following in *exact* accordance with the Apostolic tone:—

"Towards the evening I was told that there was a man enquiring after the way to heaven. I afterwards went to speak with him, and the following conversation took place. I must only premise that he was what the heathen call 'a wise man'—a pilgrim—who had gone through various mortifications, so as to make him appear to Europeans a fool and madman. He has, however, the right use of his understanding:—*I*. 'What do you want?' *He*. 'Whatever you give, I take.' *I*. 'What shall I give you?' *He*. 'I have no desire; whatever you give, I take.' *I*. 'Suppose I flog you?' *He*. 'What sin have I committed that you should flog me?'"—(p. 112.)

We are disposed to make every allowance for diversities in idiom, and for the notion which commonly obtains that it is necessary to assume authority when dealing with Indians, in order to secure their respect; but still the question recurs, "Could Paul have written such an epistle as this?" The date will shew that it was penned after Rhenius's separation from the society. Abstractedly, however, from every consideration of this kind, is there not something in the manner of expression which savours of a "lording it over God's heritage."

"The answer which the minister Rhenius writes, wishing the grace of Christ to the catechists and congregations who have applied for his return to Tinnevelly, is the following:—

"Having much considered your request, and all the circumstances, and sought the Lord's permission; and after having had many thoughts, we have decided on proceeding without delay to Pallamcotta to enquire into your affairs. And therefore we intend starting on the 24th or 25th instant. We shall probably reach Trichinopoly on the 1st or 2d of October: thither you must write and send me a letter.

"We may reach Pallamcotta on the 10th or 11th. You must make arrangements to get for us the house on the bank of the river.

"Be not of two minds; but conduct yourselves with firmness in true faith, and love, and justice, to the glory of your Saviour's name. Do not quarrel with those who are with the Church Missionary Society, but walk in

meekness, being patient, although you may plainly state what is right; and pray for them, and for us.

“ ‘ Only myself and family come now. The other brethren will remain here some time longer. In the house which you prepare for us, place some borrowed furniture, a table and chairs.

“ ‘ If you require some money, you may get it from Paranniappa Pillei in my name. When I come I shall repay him. If you show him this, he will give it you.—The Lord bless you all.

“ ‘ C. RHENIUS.

“ ‘ Arcot, Sept. 21, 1835.’

“ P.S.—Whatever Mr. Pettitt, &c., may say, until I come let the catechists and congregations be quiet and firm—not giving their signature to any papers, nor entering into any agreements.

“ ‘ The catechists and congregations must, in the fear of God, show before all men firmness and oneness of mind. If the catechists be in trouble, ought not the congregations to assist them in all needful love? Only be careful not to act foolishly. May we all have confidence in the Almighty Saviour! May we adhere to him both through good and through evil! He will strengthen those who act thus.’ ”—(pp. 490, 491.)

We have already intimated our conviction that Rhenius's anti-Church prejudices had their source in that refractory spirit which resulted from his excessive self-estimation, and which, (so far as the evidence presented by this volume goes) brought him into collision with *every* person, and *every* community, that attempted to direct or control him. The truth is, that our Church inculcates, and to some extent enforces, *subordination*. The ordinary must be obeyed—the rubric must be observed—uniformity of ceremonial must be maintained. Hence, it is surmised, arose Rhenius's opposition to episcopacy and the Prayer-book, to visitations and strict Churchmen. The extreme and unbecoming lengths to which such prejudices carried an individual who, nevertheless, could continue to labour in connection with a Church society, are as affecting as they are marvellous! How painful to read in such a volume, such an entry as this—made too, let it be observed, at the close of a sacramental sabbath :—

“ June 15.—Sabbath. Sacrament. Two heathens attended, with apparently a great desire to hear; they remained throughout the service. The catechist of Vepery was also present, expressly sent, I understood, by Mr. P., (missionary of the Gospel Propagation Society,) to observe whether there is any one of his congregation attending the word of God here.’ ”—(p. 106.)

Was it becoming to write, was it wise to publish the following passage :—

“ June 20.—Received lately the Missionary Register, &c. Read the Arch-deacon's report of his visit to Pallamcottah—errors in it about the site of the church, and about the schools. Read of a meeting of clergymen at Calcutta for prayer. Why do they not invite all ministers of the gospel to it? There is an accursed thing among them, I fear.’ ”—(pp. 406, 407.)

It is no uncommon thing to find Rhenius professing himself cordially affected towards the Church of England, and his biographer observes :—

"The preceding journal must have shown, that if, in respect of outward observances, he might be ranked with any body of British Christians, he may be said to have belonged to the English Church rather than to any other."—(p. 595.)

It is for the reader to discover the consistency of such professions with language of which the following is merely a specimen. Writing to a friend at Bombay, during his temporary secession from Tinnevely, he says :—

"If the Lord will, he can support the work when I am gone; but if he will not, and permits evil to befall the churches in consequence of my departure, or rather in consequence of the introduction of *spirit-deadening modes and ceremonies*, those will have to answer for it who have been the cause of my leaving."—(p. 453.)

Another letter, written to the corresponding Committee, in behalf of seven native Catechists, and declining in their name episcopal ordination, is conclusive as to the fact of antichurch prejudices; for there is scarcely a dissenting cavil, however hackneyed and often refuted, from the "sign of the cross in baptism" to "the gift of the Holy Spirit by laying on of the bishop's hands in ordination," which is not formally urged. Even the Apostle's creed is not exempt from disapproval, since in it, "Christ is said to have descended into hell!" After the grave specification of all these grounds of objection, the missionaries, or missionary, (for where Rhenius was, numbers could scarcely be said to rank as integers,) suggest the following modest salvo for scruples and crotchets :—

"These reasons appear to us most weighty, and sufficient to lead them, however reluctantly, to decline being ordained on such terms. Every difficulty would be obviated by making them subscribe, with this modification, 'as far as they are agreeable to the word of God.' The shortest and safest way would be to make them give a solemn promise, either verbally or in writing, that they will faithfully and conscientiously teach and preach the word of God, according to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as it is excellently expressed in some parts of the Ordering of Priests and Deacons.

"We trust the committee will fully appreciate the conscientiousness and reverence with which these men view the sacred office of the ministry. It is the true way to become faithful and efficient ministers of Christ."—(p. 382.)

Among the many who would probably record the death of Heber in their journals, we are inclined to hope that there was but one whose diary presented such an entry as this :—

"Many have so expressed themselves, as if the prosperity of the gospel cause centered in the bishop. This ought not to be. I humbly think that we should not have been visited by such heavy strokes, did we but give up the spirit of party, and embrace every servant of Christ, of whatever denomination, as our fellow-labourer, and mutually exchange our services, according to the spirit of the gospel, allowing others to differ, without putting them, either publicly or privately, at a distance from us. In this I think we,

as churchmen, have hitherto failed. We have looked on dissenters as not belonging to us, as persons with whom we could not unite: we have thought that our Church ought to be chief in the land, our form should be everywhere adopted; and with all our profession, by way of compliment, that we have no objection to the labours of our dissenting brethren, we still secretly wished they were not here at all, or at least that they should submit to us in our various opinions. Now, all this is not the spirit of Christ. Even supposing them to be really the weaker party, if we acknowledge them to be Christ's servants, why not embrace them as such, and labour together with them? Why stand on ceremony with them? Why hesitate to let them preach in our churches, and to preach in theirs? The Lord, I think, by passing events such as this, when he removes our most promising fellow-labourers, one after another, would teach us to get wiser, and yield more freely to the liberal, loving, humble spirit of the gospel. May I improve it thus!"—(pp. 296, 297.)

It may be replied to all this, "Bad as we admit it to be, uncharitable, uncandid, and weak, what else was to be expected from a person so circumstanced as Rhenius was;—himself a Lutheran by education, and having received his orders from that Church, how was it to be expected that he should not be betrayed into prejudices. The fault was that of the Society which first engaged, and afterwards continued to employ so unmanageable an agent." We rejoin—that *no* circumstances will vindicate an unchristian spirit, and that men *have* a right to expect from a missionary of the gospel, the humility, the integrity, and the love of the gospel. How far these were exemplified in that transaction which forms so prominent a subject of the present volume, still remains to be considered; and with a very brief summary of the question, we shall gladly conclude our notice.

It should be premised that a standing rule of the Madras Committee expressly prohibits the publication of any book or pamphlet by a missionary of their Society who has not first received their sanction. It should also be observed, that against this regulation Rhenius professes that he "from the very beginning protested," "always adhering to the principle, that a missionary has a right, upon his own responsibility, to circulate such tracts, &c. as he thinks proper." In explaining the grounds of separation between him and the Society, we are content to adopt Mr. Rhenius's own statement:—

"I think you view the matter in too strong a light respecting myself. Please to reflect simply on the origin of it. Mr. Harper, *whilst a member of your committee, and well knowing my sentiments*, requests me to review his book on the Church, promising to publish it in his 'Observer.' I do so, and send it to him. He delays publishing it from month to month, and from year to year, although urged to do it in the 'Observer' even by strangers. He again promises doing so in the very same 'Observer,' and in private letters to me; still nothing is forthcoming. Was it then so very extraordinary that I should at last publish it myself?"—(p. 501.)

The result of such a publication will be gathered from the following resolution of the Parent Committee:—

"The committee learn, with the deepest regret and distress, the publication in India by Mr. Rhenius of his tract entitled, a 'Review,' &c., impugning, as it does, the government, ritual, formularies, and discipline of that Church *with which he stood connected as a missionary of this society*; and that afflicting as it is to them to dissolve their connexion with one, whom, on many grounds, they highly honour and esteem, yet they feel bound in consistency, as attached members of the Church of England, to take this very painful step, and to declare that the missionary relation which has hitherto subsisted between the society and Mr. Rhenius is at an end."—(p. 503.)

The following extracts are so characteristic, that we insert them by way of continuing our narrative. (The strictly ingenuous and candid manner of putting the alternative before the simple-minded natives cannot fail to attract the reader's observation.)

"May 18.—To-day received from Mr. Tucker the resolution of the Home Committee, by which my connexion with the Society is dissolved on account of the little green books. Tucker is also on his way to Pallamcotta in great haste, to take charge of my post.

"May 22.—We sent for all the catechists, and acquainted them with the Committee's resolution. I told them faithfully the cause, &c. I asked them the simple question, Shall I go or not? They all replied, No. I asked them further, *Whether they will join Mr. Tucker and the Bishop of Calcutta, or whether they will abide with us, under the superintendence of our Lord Jesus Christ, as heretofore?* I represented to them, that with Mr. Tucker and the Bishop they would, perhaps, have no want of money, &c.; but that with us, after our separation from the Society, they may, now and then, be put on short allowance, if the Lord should see fit thus to try us. After some discussion and explanation, they all declared, as with one voice, that they will abide with us as hitherto, and live in faith on the Lord's care. It was then settled, that, as the Church Missionary Society will have it so, we separate from them. The brethren, Schaffter, Müller, and Lechler, are of the same mind. John Dévasagáyam (the native clergyman) wavers, and will probably cleave to Mr. Tucker.

"So this is a memorable day for the churches in Tinnevelly. In the evening we had for our encouragement the beautiful passage in Zephaniah iii. 16, 17. The intelligence has already spread. Many came weeping, and declared they would be content with *conji* and rice, rather than be subjected to this change.

"May 23.—Having understood that yesterday there were two catechists who dissented from the rest, I called them all together again, in order to discuss their objections. There were four persons, Jacob (now not a catechist), Esódián, Sámidásen, and Sarkunnen Winfried, teacher of the seminary. Their objections were irrelevant to the point before us, but they declared they would not join with the other catechists: so I let them go. But Sarkunnen and Sámidásen got better light on the subject, and retracted their declaration. Besides these, various other subjects were discussed which naturally presented themselves in our circumstances. All was explained and settled."—(pp. 479, 480.)

Well, in due time Mr. Tucker arrives. Rhenius apologizes for the publication, and on the strength of this apology, asks for a withdrawal of the Society's resolution. This was pronounced impossible, and the final result of the interview is thus conveyed:—

"After mature deliberation, therefore, I declared that, in obedience to our Lord's words, 'resist not evil,' and 'if any man will take away thy coat,

let him have thy cloak also,' I would give up my agreement with the catechists to remain with them, and will leave Tinnevely and proceed to Madras."—(p. 481.)

This was the determination of May 29, 1835 ; and in a letter of the following day, addressed to Mr. Tucker as Secretary of the Madras Committee, he confirms it with these words :—" I see that my remaining would only produce strife and contention—an evil by all means to be prevented, if possible." Accordingly, on the following month, he left for Madras. In August he made, in conjunction with Mr. Lechler, " a reconnoitring visit to Arcot and its neighbourhood ;" and reporting that " every thing was favourable to the plan, they returned to Madras, and made preparations for transferring themselves to the new station."

In consequence, however, of letters from the catechists of Tinnevely, calling upon him to return, we find the following entry for September 19 :—

" It strikes me more and more, that I did wrong in leaving Tinnevely. We, in a manner sanctioned the injustice of the act of the Society. The separating me from my churches for no proper cause was an unjust act. In Tinnevely the Lord gave us, in various ways, to understand that we ought not to leave it. We left, however, in order to avoid strife and contention between opposition missions. But peace has not been obtained; and the congregations and catechists have called on us to return: they have written the same to the committee, and openly declared their dissatisfaction. All things considered, it appears to me my duty to proceed to Pallamcotta immediately.

" My three brethren hesitate as to the propriety of their returning with me. They will therefore wait here till they hear from me from Pallamcotta. Great has been the conflict in my mind. But the Lord has heard my prayer in relieving me from doubts, and giving me a feeling of assurance that I ought to go."—(pp. 489, 490.)

The sequel is soon told. He went accordingly, and maintained a distinct mission ! This step was the occasion of a newspaper warfare, which had the worst possible effect as regarded the temper of the combatants, and the interests of religion in that land ; and unless we are misinformed, it is but very recently that the wounds thus inflicted upon the unity of the Church have been healed.

In presenting this succinct account of that which is the real burden of the volume, we have purposely excluded all those extrinsic matters which mixed themselves up with the transaction. We have given the *facts*, and given them in the words either of the agent or of his biographer.

What now is the line of defence set up by the Messrs. Rhenius ?

In reference to his indecent attack upon that Church by which he had been supported for twenty years in the pursuit of the object to which he had devoted himself, the father writes—" I broke no *engagement* !—I had given no *promise* !—I *apologized* for the publication !"

At a subsequent period he thus addresses the Committee :—

“ Thus, then, you have separated me from my flock, because I was not a dissembler, but a straightforward minister of the gospel, endeavouring to purify a portion of Christ’s Church from errors which confessedly have been retained in it from Popery—an endeavour which you must allow to be the duty of every minister of Christ.”—(p. 312.)

Even the son, however, has misgivings that it was not altogether *decent* to labour in connection with, and be supported by the members of a Christian Church, and then to turn round and abuse that Church in its constitution and formularies. The main stress therefore of the editor’s special pleading is contained in the following question :—

“ All things considered, then, we would put the single question—If Mr. Rhenius did wrong in publishing the ‘ Review,’ did the Society do right in insisting on his retiring from Tinnevelly ?”—(p. 506.)

We say, “ all things considered,” could the Society have done otherwise ? Though no “ pledge” had been *extorted*, that as a Lutheran clergyman Mr. Rhenius should in all things conform to rubrics, and to the several minutiae of that ecclesiastical discipline which is properly obligatory upon ministers of the Anglican Church, yet we fearlessly ask any thoroughly ingenuous and upright man, whether the sort of connection which subsisted between the parties, would not of itself involve a tacit pledge, that nothing should be done or taught by example or precept on the part of the *agent*, that was opposed to an ecclesiastical system which was venerated and beloved by the *employers* ? When therefore they found this confidence outraged—their Church attacked—the attack circulated, and divisions thus wantonly introduced, were they not unquestionably warranted in deciding that this should no longer be carried on in their own premises, in schools and chapels maintained by themselves ? Could they forbear saying to Mr. Rhenius, “ You have grievously deceived us. When, as members of the Church of England, we engaged your services as a missionary, you could not for a moment suppose that we contemplated the possibility that an agent so confided in should speak, or teach, or write any thing contrary to our Church ? When we entrusted you with large sums for the furtherance of our grand object, we could not believe that you were setting to the native disciples the example of rancorous hostility to our ecclesiastical establishment. You have, however, betrayed our trust—you have misappropriated our resources—and now the least that you can do is to remove from a position which you have occupied under false colours.”

This, be it observed, is only one ground that might have been urged by the Society. To us, however, it does appear *so* strong,

that we are not careful to enter further into the controversy. We do not hesitate to repeat that we are content to leave the issue, pending on this question addressed to any straightforward Presbyterian or conscientious Dissenter—"How would you have felt, what would you have done, if a *Churchman* had taken advantage of your missionary zeal to attack and subvert your deep-seated, conscientious, and, as you believe, scriptural convictions, as to Church polity?"—The case is too plain to require an elaborate advocacy; and we turn away from the consideration of it, exclaiming, "there is such a thing as common honesty," and (we may add) 'as common sense.' How much of this latter commodity may be fairly ascribed to the editor, we will not presume to determine. There are many parts of his volume, however, which apparently entitle him to claim but a very slight dividend. For example:—

"Almost every member of the committee was, or might have been, acquainted with the fact, that Mr. Rhenius did hold those views; and they had, two years before, received from him this very pamphlet in manuscript. It was simply the *publication* of his opinions, which, in their eyes, now demanded the dissolution of the connexion."—(pp. 503, 504.)

And again:—

"Query—Would so much obloquy have been thrown on Mr. Rhenius if he had gone out of his way to publish a defence of the Church of England, or a panegyric on it?"—(p. 510.)

As a specimen of style a single sample may suffice:—

"Lastly, there is the cry of charity wounded, charity's bonds broken. And this from such a quarter! Charity! Why, how much charity was there in originally thrusting Mr. Rhenius forth for such a reason as was stated, from among a people who loved and honoured him? How much charity in inflicting on him the greatest of wounds in their power, while at the same time they professed towards him all personal regard and esteem? How much charity in not allowing the people quietly to be taught concerning Jesus, by the teachers of their own choice? Alas for that heavenly visitant among the tabernacles of men! She came down to earth, 'seeking not her own;' but we, in our zeal, rend her in pieces between us, and present her, a mangled loathsome spectacle, to astonished and insulted angels."—(p. 521.)

We return, then, to our original conclusion. The book is a failure. It might have been useful;—it is worse than useless—written in bad taste—conceived in a bad spirit. We confidently repeat the assertion, that the author does not understand his subject. When we find a Christian biographer vindicating unchristian harshness, by saying that "it is characteristic of strong minds to use strong language"—when we find him "apologizing" for egotism by a quotation from Coleridge, to the effect that,

"If a man be a victim to abuse on account of superior talents or great public services, he must continually unite with his own person a deep sense

of the value of his genius; the most modest man is worked into a feeling of self-consciousness from the continued necessity of repelling unmerited abuse."—(p. 537.)

When moreover we find him speaking of true greatness—as residing “in the person of one whom the world, and many Christians too, denominate the *humble missionary*,” (thus evidently repudiating the true glory of the office!)—and, finally, upholding a dictatorial spirit, with the eulogistic remark, “he was born to command,”—we do feel warranted in the grave asseveration that “he knows not what he says nor whereof he affirms.”

We will only add, that if ever we should see the volume in the hands of a chaplain or of a missionary, we shall feel it right forthwith to prescribe, as an antidote—‘Read Pearson’s Life of Swartz, if you would really learn what ought to be the character of a missionary, and what the style of missionary biography.’

THE EXPEDIENCY OF PREACHING AGAINST THE AMUSEMENTS OF THE WORLD, *considered in a Letter to a Clerical Friend*. By the Rev. HENRY WOODWARD, A.M., Rector of Fethard. London: *Duncan*. 12mo. 1841.

“*Fas est ab hoste doceri*,”—is there a more hacknied adage in the whole “dictionary of quotations?” The reason, of course, is,—as in the similar cases of “*Audi alteram partem*,”—“Honesty is the best policy,” and the like,—that the truth enunciated is one which it is important always to keep in mind, and which, in a world like this, is sure to be of frequent application.

We have seen certain representations of late, of the general character and habits of that portion of the clergy which is sometimes termed “evangelical,”—which, at first sight somewhat shocked and irritated us. On further reflection, however, we thought it the most honest and expedient course, neither to pass them by with disdain, nor to meet them merely with an indignant denial. Few things, we remembered, can be gravely written down and printed, without having at least some slight tincture of truth in their composition. It seemed the wiser course, therefore, to try to extract any useful lesson which might be learned, even from the railings of an opponent; than to turn away in useless wrath and unprofitable indignation.

“The partisans of Low Churchmen,” said a morning paper

which has ever been a warm defender of the Oxford Tractarians,—
 “The partisans of Low Churchism, who had *in general* degene-
 “rated from the asceticism of the first ‘Evangelicals,’ *into self-*
 “*indulgence*, were extremely bitter against the Oxford Tracts.”
 When we first read this passage, which appeared in print about
 two months since, we were struck with astonishment at the writer’s
 audacity. We wondered how any man, meaning to obtain the
 slightest degree of credence,—could so far transgress the ninth
 command, as unhesitatingly to affirm, of the evangelical clergy,
 that they had “in general,” “degenerated into self-indulgence.”

A little reflection, however, reminded us, that except there had
 been some slight ground on which to build this charge, it would
 hardly have been made. No man would venture to assert that
 “the inhabitants of Ireland are a tribe of negroes, and in colour a
 jet black ;” or that “the people called ‘Friends’ are remarkable
 for their devotion to ecclesiastical architecture.” Even to construct
 and pass off a positive calumny, a certain amount of truth, like
 the silver wash on the base metal shilling, is always requisite.
 Far wiser, then, must it be, to separate the truth from the false-
 hood, and to learn the lesson therein contained, however distaste-
 ful,—than to content ourselves with upbraiding the calumniator,
 and stigmatizing the calumny. We looked a little further, there-
 fore, in hope to find some explanation of what the writer of this
 unjustifiable charge really meant. Nor did we find much difficulty
 in tracing the quarter from which his notions had been borrowed.

In the *British Critic* of October 1840, we find the charge
 which was compendiously repeated by the newspaper editor of
 April 1841,—elaborately set forth. Any one who reads it will
 see, at once, whence the later retailer of the calumny had gleaned
 his ideas of the case.

“Twenty years ago, perhaps, the probability was, that a man who held
 what are falsely called evangelical opinions, was a more active, painstaking
 parish minister than the common run. We have lived to see this system
 embraced by the world—the world in its worst sense. It exists in a hundred
 base diluted shapes, as liberalism, as semi-socinianism, as nominalism, as
 indifference to all religion, at least to all positive doctrine, positive duties,
 or any positive authority in spiritual matters. It is become the creed, or no
 creed, of power, wealth, fashion, and sensuality.

“Your flash evangelical young clergyman was merely a gay fellow at the
 University; he married a young lady of rank, piety, and wealth, falls in with
 her mode, and is presented by a body of trustees to the first vacancy which
 occurs in an influential church, which they have purchased. To do him jus-
 tice, he announces a good deal; he institutes or reforms several schools, a
 district visiting society, a Thursday evening lecture, three school-room lec-
 tures, and other undoubted organs of usefulness. He proposes to repair the
 church, and to extend the west gallery up the side aisles. In every depart-
 ment of his little reign the note of preparation is heard. He gives his
 money, his time, and his lungs, without sparing. A few quiet, old-fashioned

people, and a few envious young ones, are a little scandalized at some of his ways, but their feeble voice is overpowered in the universal applause. One peevish, eccentric old gentleman, laughed at by everybody, privately remonstrates with the youngster, and gets condescendedly quizzed in return; he then, as a last resource, writes to the bishop, and is by him good-naturedly hushed. There are, however, one or two trifling drawbacks to the new vicar's acceptance, which do not tell much now, but will tell by-and-by. Neither he nor his lady can bear the old parsonage, an old-fashioned little place, in the midlength of a noisy street, three yards from the pavement, and apparently crushed between the more modern, more spacious and lofty mansions of two wealthy tradespeople. This truly spiritual couple having been unfortunately used to the country, cannot live without shrubberies and flowers, and cannot endure noise and smoke. So they get leave somehow, we know not how, to live an uncommonly long mile out of the town. He chooses an elegant mansion in the Elizabethan style, built on a commanding eminence some ten or fifteen years ago by a great lace manufacturer, who, becoming bankrupt by the change of times, did not leave his place to his children after him. The manufacturer liked to see the town where he had lived all his days, and whence his wealth was derived. To it therefore he turned his chief rooms and windows. But fifteen years had made great difference in the town, which has both shot up more chimneys, become more smoky, and has moreover climbed a good way up the very hill where our youthful couple have perched their nest. What does the young clergyman do in this emergency? He gives the carriage-drive a new sweep, he makes his back his front, he plants out the town with deep lines of laurels, and raised banks of American shrubs, and Lombardy poplars, so as to see nothing of the uncouth mass, but just the pinnacles of St. Mary's (or Mary's Church, as his lady chooses to style it), and a picturesque corner of the town which dips down a sloping bank into the broad reach of the river. The whole of the town, with its forest of red tiles and chimneys, is too overpowering for him; a presentiment of its impracticability seems to whisper, 'Thou shalt see but the utmost part of them, and shalt not see them all.' However, our young clergyman does not intend that this sweet retreat shall be the home of his affection; he means it to be nothing but the *opportunity* of ease and retirement, if he should require it,—a sort of potential paradise: for as "stone walls do not a prison make," so a delightful mansion and grounds are not an indulgence to those who are determined to exercise spiritual self-denial. Our friend accordingly scorns to be a Sybarite, and would be a public man. Towards noon he is seen walking or riding into the town. There for two or three hours he is seen walking about, conferring with the various members of his parochial staff, and seemingly very busy—believed by every one to be seeing much of others, but experienced by every one in particular to be rather a repeller than an encourager of advances, and a prompt cutter-short of conversation. By three o'clock he is emeritus for the day, and perhaps many miles from the smoke of his parish. This is the period of his activity—we will not describe the season of disappointment and languor, nor say how long the peculiarities of the earth, air, or water of the neighbourhood allow the lady, and consequently her husband, to reside on or rather near the living."—(pp. 363—365.)

Now here we have not the mere secular politician of the newspaper, but the clergyman of the English Church himself describing his brethren. As we have already said,—it would be self-delusion to set the whole down as a fiction,—a mere calumny. Caricature though it be, it is still the caricature of some living personage, or rather, of a class of persons.

The lovers of Evangelical truth have been rejoicing, of late

years,—perhaps too hastily and unthinkingly,—in the rapid progress of their views:—the subsidence of opposition;—and the apparent probability of a great and almost general prevalence of the doctrines of the Reformation throughout the Church of England. Almost universally has the inevitable danger been overlooked,—that as evangelical religion became more popular and more fashionable, it might become, in its turn, more pliable and more accommodating. The world could not quietly come into the church without bringing a mass of worldly maxims and principles along with it. Besides which, the cessation of scorn, contumely, and such kind of persecution as modern notions permit, was the cessation, also, of a purifying, sifting, and brightening process, formerly always going on in the church.

This being the case, then;—and remembering, too, that while the deterring motives of threatened contempt, poverty, and scorn, have vanished, on the one hand,—the attracting motives of popularity, a speedy provision, and an easy and honoured career, have greatly augmented, on the other,—remembering, we say, these things, we can admit the possibility of some cases having existed, of late years, of which the above sketch is only an allowable caricature. We admit the *possibility*; but we cannot add, that we admit the *fact*, for the living individual whose portrait is thus given, has certainly never yet crossed our path. But what of all this? “*What are the tares to the wheat? saith the Lord.*” We know, and at once concede, that just as the admission of Christians to a full toleration and even to court favour, brought into the Church, in the days of Constantine, a crowd of immense and unsound professors,—so the ceasing of the contempt and scorn heretofore affixed, in the Church, to everything called “evangelical” or “methodistical,” must have had an exactly similar tendency. Not a doubt can exist that the triumph of Mr. Simeon, at Cambridge, over all opposition—the honour and praise which surrounded his later years, and the fact of his having left a number of benefices at the disposal of trustees by him appointed,—*must* have very materially changed the views and calculations of many a youth intending to enter the Church through the doors of that university. All this, with its natural consequences, we readily admit; but we do not admit that the main body of earnest and upright followers of the Romaines, and Newtons, and Scotts of former days, ought to be made accountable for the laxity and worldly conformity of the “mixed multitude” that follows the camp of Israel.

Nevertheless, let us derive what advantage we may, from these reproofs, however misapplied or unmeasured they may seem. First,

let us discern and acknowledge a good which our gracious Lord may be bringing out of evil. If "self-indulgence" be indeed spreading among any of those who profess to hold evangelical views, it is well that we should be promptly and distinctly warned of it. A position of general popularity is by no means a safe or a desirable one. Better is it for us to be jealously watched by *British Critics* and *British Magazines*, and to have every false step instantly pointed out, than to be permitted idly to stray into forbidden paths, or to fall asleep on the enchanted ground.

The very danger indicated in the sketch we have already quoted was most distinctly pointed out, and a caution against it recorded, in the well-known *Life of the Rev. Thomas Scott*. The biographer says :—

"I must give it as my deliberate judgment, which I think will be sanctioned by the suffrages of those who most closely observed him, that, of all the men I have known, he manifested the most unfeigned and practical belief of those numerous Scriptures, which pronounce riches dangerous to the welfare and salvation of the soul; and that, in consequence, acting upon his own favourite maxim, that what is best for the soul is *really* best for us, he ever looked upon worldly possessions with a jealous eye, for his family as well as for himself. Particularly he deprecated the idea of *clergymen* aspiring at wealth; meaning by that term much more moderate property than some would understand by it.

"Agreeably to these sentiments, we have seen him expressing a strong disapprobation of ministers encumbering themselves with lucrative academies, and losing perhaps the sacred character in that of tutors. He had, if possible, a still stronger aversion to their aiming at rich marriages. A marriage with a rich wife was, I believe, what none of his sons would have ventured to propose to him. Few things would have alarmed him more for their safety, or more grieved him as a dereliction of the principles with which he had laboured to inspire them. Often have we heard him descant with satisfaction on the case of Mr. Walker of Truro, who declined a connexion with a lady, in all other respects suitable, because she possessed £10,000! and often mention the sarcastic congratulation, offered at a visitation by a dignified clergyman to an evangelical brother who had married a lady of fortune, 'Ay, ay, brother——, we all aim at the same object, though we have our different ways of attaining it!' Hence, when many years ago two young ladies of large fortune were placed under his care, it was one of his counsels to them, that neither of them should marry a clergyman: 'for,' said he, 'if he is not a good one, he is not worthy of you; and, if he is a good one, you will spoil him.'

"And all that we have been now relating was held, it should be observed, and was persisted in, by one who had felt more than most men the inconveniences arising from the want of money, even as an obstruction to his great and good designs."—(Life, pp. 408, 409.)

More emphatically, however, still, and with still greater authority, was a similar warning given by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, when writing to the Corinthian church, in which, also, the dry-rot of "self-indulgence" had made its appearance. "*But this I say, brethren, the time is short: it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none; and they*

“ that weep, as though they wept not ; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not ; and they that buy, as though they possessed not ; and they that use this world, as not abusing it : for the fashion of this world passeth away.”—(1 Cor. vii. 29—31.)

Let these things, then, provoke the Church to godly jealousy. We are fallen upon times in which a mere easy gentlemanly mode of getting through professional duties will no longer pass muster ; even though the Sunday's sermon should be doctrinally correct, fairly composed, and delivered with ease and fluency. The maintainer of tractarian principles, unsound though they be, will demand and obtain a fuller credence with the multitude, if he exhibits a higher degree of self-denial and devotedness in his life. Nor are these the only competitors we shall have to contend with.

We were much struck, the other day, with the description given of a continental Romish priest, by one who had escaped the snares of that apostate Church. He spoke with no fondness for the communion he had left, when he said, “ The priest of my parish was most laborious, most charitable, most devoted. If he had twenty sick persons on his list, he would allow no day to pass without seeing *every one of them*. And I have known him, not unfrequently, part with *every thing he had in the world*, save the mere clothes he wore, in ministering to their necessities.”

These ministers of Rome are multiplying in England. Many of them are monks, vowed to poverty. Against such an one, if really enthusiastic, devoted, and laborious, what kind of contest can be maintained by the “ flash evangelical young clergyman ” described by the *British Critic* ?

Let it not be said that we are distrusting the power of the Gospel to meet and overthrow the sophistries of Rome. We are not so mistrusting it. But let it be ever borne in mind that a pastor's *life* is of vastly more importance than a pastor's *sermons* ;—or, at least, that *sermons* not duly supported by a *life* in full consistency with them, will have little power over the hearts of the people. To discourse upon such a text, as “ *Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world,* ” without shewing any kind of indifference to worldly things, will lead to no useful result.

And, in estimating the respective powers of the opposing principles, there is one thing which we ought never to forget ; and that is, that while false principles generally act with their *full* force, the truth always acts with *diminished* force. The one is borne along by the tide ; the other has to strive against it. Let a man lacerate his body, like the flagellants in the Church of Rome, or like some recent followers, in fasting, “ bodily exercise,” &c. at

Oxford; and let him expect, by these austerities, to gain the favour of God, and a place in heaven,—to such attempts Satan will offer no opposition. He will rather encourage such a worshipper in his mistaken course;—knowing that CHRIST is the *only* way to the favour of God; and that all other ways, however holy or meritorious they may appear, in reality lead *from* heaven and holiness, and not *to* them. And, in like manner, if the sinner fancied that the washing the feet of a dozen poor beggars every day, or any other kind of “voluntary humiliation,” would confer a title to eternal glory, in any such dream the enemy of his soul would gladly encourage him to remain. It is *only* when the true way to holiness and happiness is discovered, and the believer’s face is really turned Zionwards,—that a constant, vehement, and persevering opposition begins. Here, therefore, is a circumstance which creates a great inequality between the contending parties. The Romish devotee, believing that his labours, and his self-denial are working out his salvation, and being left by the tempter in this his fatal error, swims with the stream of natural corruption, and is aided by Satan’s flatteries and counsels. The believer in the gospel, on the other hand, knowing that a man is not saved by the works of the law, and shunning, therefore, all reliance on his own doings, is immediately beset by the temptation to do nothing,—to look upon his salvation as already secured, and thence to relax in any exertions either for his own growth in grace, or for the good of others. The corruptions of human nature and the arts of the tempter, thus *help forward* the devotees of a false religion; while they *retard*, by every possible means, the progress of one who is in the right way.

But it is time that we said something of the work before us. We are induced thus immediately and prominently to notice it, by the high estimation in which the author is justly held. Were it the work of an inferior man, we might have judged it the wiser course to pass it by in silence. But Mr. Woodward’s opinions cannot be so lightly dealt with: they must produce a certain effect, whether for good or harm.

And we regret to say that we have seldom seen, of late, any work by a man of the like rank, that seemed to us so calculated to produce a deleterious effect. All the earlier portions of the volume,—all that which concerns the principal question handled, appears to us positively mischievous. It is only when we approach the close, and Mr. W. comes to speak of the *mode* in which subjects of the kind treated of, should be handled in the pulpit,—it is only then that we recognize his usual accuracy and discrimination, and can, on *that* point, cordially agree with him.

The book opens thus :—

“ My Dear—, The subject on which we conversed so much at — has engaged no small share of my attention since ; and so important does it appear to me, on the fullest review, to draw the attention of the more serious clergy to the point in question, that I have resolved to bring these lines, addressed to you, before the public eye. The matter, then, for consideration is, Whether it is, or is not, expedient to preach directly against what are called the amusements of the world? In my judgment, however particular cases may perhaps sometimes justify it, as a general rule. it is not.

“ In the first place, it is, I conceive, the peculiar duty of the Christian pastor, rather to influence the mind and inculcate principles, than to regulate the outward conduct of those committed to his care. The Roman Catholic priest is a kind of spiritual, indeed I might say secular, magistrate in his parish. And this is in full keeping with a system, whose Head claims authority over all the civil polities and reigning potentates of the earth. But far different are the vocation and the mission of the reformed pastor. His business is with the souls of men. He acts as the delegate of One whose kingdom was not of this world ; and who said to him who called for his temporal interference, ‘ Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you ? ’—(pp. 1, 2.)

Is it not strange that the reverend writer could so lose sight of the apostolic instructions, extending even to the details of female ornaments (1 Tim. ii. 9, 1 Pet. iii. 2,) as to assert that the duty of the Christian pastor is “ rather to influence the mind and inculcate principles, than to regulate the outward conduct ? ” Doubtless any efficient regulation of the outward conduct must originate in an influence exerted over the mind ; but why set one in opposition to the other ; or represent, that the pastor’s duty is “ to inculcate principles,” and there to stop ?

But we proceed to consider Mr. W.’s reasons for neutrality in these matters :—

“ I think, then, that publicly denouncing these pursuits, and drawing all eyes on those who partake of them, is calculated to divide a congregation, as it were, into two parties ; to identify the clergyman with the one, and to place him in an attitude apparently adverse to the other, while the line of demarcation by no means secures a right or equitable division.”—(p. 12.)

A leading deficiency in much of modern preaching, is, that it does not sufficiently “ divide a congregation into two parties.” The whole Bible constantly keeps this division in view. Our Lord’s preaching is full of it ; and the Apostles closely followed his example. And all that Satan desires, and all his votaries would ask, is, that they may be allowed to live in the world, and yet be reckoned as of the Church ;—to live the life of Dives, still hoping to go, when they die, with Lazarus, into Abraham’s bosom.

But here are more reasons for silence and prudence ; on the old plea of “ expediency :”—

“ Can it be desirable, or right, or fitting, that such children should sit and hear their father’s and their mother’s conduct dragged forth to view, that it may be marked for public reprobation? Can it but be calculated to set

either the child against the parent, or the lamb against the shepherd of the flock? And can any thing be more deplorable than the one or than the other?"—(pp. 33, 34.)

"The same applies in all its force to the case of servants. Many a mistress who, from inveterate custom, or from a mistaken sense of duty, partakes, though rarely perhaps, of the amusements of the world, nevertheless 'looketh well to the ways of her household.' She assembles them daily to prayer,—she supplies them with copies of the Scripture,—she discourages all levities amongst her servants; and in every instance, the above alone, excepted, is a pattern to her family of order, regularity, and decorum. Now, suppose the domestics in such a family are told, as they often are, that the large and jolly meetings held in many instances by servants would be hurtful and dangerous for them, but that the assemblies of the higher orders are necessary appendages to their stations, and should on that account be conformed to. Let this be ever so fallacious, yet what harm would it do a servant to believe it? On the other hand, what mischief might it occasion to a young footman, to hear such a mistress arraigned as a sinner against her own soul, and a rebel to her God!"—(pp. 36, 37.)

Where is this sort of concealment or clipping of the truth, to end? The argument, if worth a straw, applies with equal force, to a dozen other offences as well as to this. Take covetousness, for instance, the ruling vice of the day; and the one against which ministers ought to set their faces as a flint:—when it reigns in a man's heart, can his children or servants fail to see it? How will you, then, dare to weaken the child's respect and attention to its parent, or the servant's deference and reliance on his master's guidance, by plainly enforcing the apostolic caution, "the love of money is the root of all evil," and by applying it to the individual consciences of your hearers? Or how enforce the strict observance of the Sabbath, when you know that many of the most "respectable" of your congregation, are returning home from church to give or to join a dinner-party; an act necessarily involving an entire breach of the divine command in the case of ten or twelve tradesmen and dependents?

The strangest part of Mr. Woodward's argument, however, is the following:—

"I am persuaded, that amongst those who, however mistakenly, think it a duty to their position in society, not wholly to withdraw from public amusements (and who, I will add, are confirmed in that opinion by the revolting exhibitions just now alluded to), are some who are not far from the kingdom of God,—nay, (may we not dare to hope?) who are sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty.

"It is true that a great change has of late years taken place in the upper orders of society; and that conformity to the world in these particulars is not so general as in former days; and this certainly places the Christian (if there be such), who still frequents the theatre and the ball-room, in a different position from that in which his father stood. For now the serious character who is present at such scenes, doubtless goes *against* the stream of the opinion, and current of the practice, of the religious body; whereas, in bygone years, he had both *with* him. In times which I can well remember, it never perhaps occurred to the strictest saints—for many I am sure there were—who

appeared in the midst of scenes of levity, that they were wrong in being there. They felt it to be their cross—a painful necessity which they could not avoid—a duty to society and to their families, which it would be a culpable self-indulgence to decline—in such a spirit many conformed outwardly to the world; but, whatever other trials sinful flesh and blood were in their case, as is common to man, daily subject to, the brilliances of life were any thing but attractive in their eyes. Trials they were, but not of the seductive kind; they were trials of their patience; they put to proof how far their charity could cover the multitude of sins; they tested and measured the degree to which they had learned to deny themselves, and to subordinate their own wills and fondest inclinations to the will of God. In a spirit of lesser martyrdom, many thus mingled with the thoughtless crowd—and never did they cling more closely to the cross of Christ than when He appeared thus crucified afresh, and put to an open shame.”—(pp. 15—17.)

“It is quite clear, that if any person is once persuaded that his duty requires of him to be present in scenes, however vicious and abandoned, that presence implies no participation in the guilt, nor misprision of the treason.”—(p. 18.)

There is something, to our minds at least, quite novel in these representations. Among all the varieties of “martyrdom” of which we had heard, this one had never before occurred,—the martyrdom of being “present at scenes of a *vicious and abandoned* character” from “a painful necessity which they could not avoid; *a duty to society and their families* which it would be a culpable self-indulgence to decline!!” Truth to tell, we are compelled to class the whole idea as one of those creations of the imagination in which our Irish brethren are sometimes apt to abound. But we are glad to turn from that portion of Mr. Woodward’s essay with which we cannot agree, to the remaining discussion, in which we fully accord. The following observations have much practical wisdom, as well as substantial truth.

“I would, as far as possible, use a language which, while it left my hearers at liberty as to their exterior habits, would clearly set before them the claims and nature of those rival objects which bid for ascendancy in their hearts. I would not so stigmatize the overt act, that those who wished to join in scenes of gaiety would be ashamed of the appearance of their doing so, or would be frayed away by mere senseless scruple from recreations which they loved; but I would so exhibit all vain pursuits and glittering follies in the light of Scripture, and so contrast them with the glorious realities and living substances of religion, as, in the estimation of every capable understanding, to convert the pleasures of the world into pains and penalties, and its amusements into worse than weariness. I would tell my hearers, on an authority which none could gainsay, that those ‘that live in pleasure are dead while they live.’ I would declare to them, that ‘all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doth the will of God abideth for ever.’ I would, with the great Instructor, place the fleeting joys of earth in juxtaposition with the durable felicities of eternity, and leave it to the mind and heart to make their option. ‘Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again: but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.’ In short, I would cease from that petty fire, which

only stimulates to resistance and provokes return, and bring at once to bear upon the congregation the heavy artillery of those fundamental and eternal truths which are revealed from heaven."—(pp. 87—89.)

"Let it then be distinctly and constantly proclaimed, that no Christian, consistently with his profession, can perform any action, engage in any pursuit, or indulge in any pleasure which he conscientiously believes will be remembered with regret at the hour of death, and in the day of judgment. Let this truth be pressed with an earnestness and solemnity as though the preacher felt the nothingness of time, and the awful reality of eternity. Let him urge it upon his hearers, as one who pleads with them for their life. Let him put it to their understandings, to the reason that God has given them, to the vicegerent which He has implanted in their breasts, whether it is not more than madness to set up any standard or criterion of our actions, short of this simple recognition, that there is another life, and that that life will be everlasting weal or woe."—(pp. 91, 92.)

"But there is still a more searching test, to which every voluntary pursuit and permitted pleasure should be put, than even the sense of an ever-present Deity; namely, that at all times and in all places we stand before that Being who was crucified for our sins. And if He be thus continually before us, 'is there not a cause?' Should the Christian ever be unmindful of a Saviour's sufferings? Should he be of one heart and mind with the thoughtless and unfeeling throng, to whom that Saviour thus speaks, and speaks, alas! in vain, 'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow?' Should not the language of the Psalmist ever flow from the abundance of his heart, 'If I forget thee, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth?' What St. Paul resolved, as respected his ministry at Corinth, *he* extends to the whole circle of his conversation. He is 'determined not to know anything save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.' Whatsoever is not of faith in Him he accounts as sin; he esteems as polluted and forbidden every thing which has not some savour of His name, or at least whatever is calculated for a moment to shade off the cross from the vision of the soul. 'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ,' is his spontaneous answer to the wiles of the tempter, and the allurements of the world. His firm resolve and fervent prayers are, that in his experience that scene of sorrow may never be reacted, when 'the Lord looked upon Peter,' and when Peter, with bleeding heart and wounded conscience, went forth from his presence, and 'wept bitterly.'"—(pp. 101—103.)

What can be better conceived, or more fitly expressed than this? And why could not Mr. Woodward have been satisfied with thus excellently pointing out, *how* the amusements of the world should be preached against;—instead of positively, and, we think, unscripturally, deciding, at the very outset, that they ought not to be preached against *at all*?

SHORT NOTICES.

THE CHINESE AS THEY ARE. By G. T. LAY, Esq., Naturalist in Beechey's Expedition: late Resident at Canton. London: *Ball*. 1841.

THE Author of this volume possesses much originality and independence of mind. He is evidently, too, a close observer of life, and occasionally clothes his thoughts in striking and felicitous language. Yet with these valuable qualities there is a frequent *cumbersomeness* about his style, which must, we fear, damage him not a little in the estimation of the general reader. A few instances taken at random will explain our meaning:—

“All nations illumined with the rays of civilization shew an aptitude to cherish the idea that, for female charms, their nativity is without a parallel.”—(p. 102.)

“I will not be dogmatic in these remarks, and proceed no further in prescribing an opinion than the enunciation of this fact,” &c.—(p. 260.)

“Science reminds us of the emblem of justice, who carries a sword in her hand; empiricism shews like counterfeit pity, who, although her looks melt with tenderness, has her fingers tipped with the fangs of a viper.”—(p. 234.)

See also the following curious example in the rule of proportion:—

“Take the goodliest among Europeans, who belong to the Caucasian race, and place him beside the choicest among the sons of China, who pertain to the Mongolian: then take the fairest specimen of the intellectual productions of each, and set them together, and you have the following analogy: as is the man in outward symmetry and beauty, so are his works, or the pledges he gives of his mental capacity.”—(p. 14.)

From this we infer that the Author considers handsome men to be great, and ugly men little, geniuses; an opinion which we do not venture to gainsay, but content ourselves with delivering it over to the tender mercies of all our *unsymmetrical* acquaintance.

There is, however, as we have already intimated, far better material than this in his book, for the sake of which we are quite willing to pardon any absence of simplicity or occasional pedantry* which may have fallen under our notice. We doubt not the reader will agree with us when he meets with such passages as the following:

FACILITIES FOR MISSIONARY LABOUR IN CHINA.

“The hearts of all men are wrought upon by kind offices,—‘Thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head;’—but the Chinese seem to be peculiarly

* Ex. gr. a semicircle is called a “hemicyclion”; a hoe, a “sarculum”; and even such undignified things as sweepings rejoice in the sesquipedal appellation “rejectamenta.”

susceptive in this, either from nature or education, or perhaps from both. To present a little child with a *tseen*, or cash, about the twentieth part of a penny, to allow a native to look into my collecting case, or to examine the texture of my coat, were favours which never missed a large recognition, not only from the parties indulged, but also from all the bystanders. Popularity is of very easy purchase in China;—a courteous smile, a look of complacency, and so forth, will seldom fail to insure a large stock of it. If a stranger enter one of their public assemblies, take a seat, and appear happy in his situation, every eye is directed towards him,—‘Here is a man from afar,’ they seem to say, ‘who is pleased with us, and therefore we will overwhelm him with our admiration.’ Of this I have seen many examples, and trust that I shall live long enough to see many more when the way is clear. A few of the outward garnitures of kindness and goodwill would be not only a passport, but enable a man to travel up and down in China in a blaze of reputation. A missionary, therefore, if he understood his business, would hardly fail of earning that applause which would put him upon a sort of vantage-ground, and give his reproofs and counsels a twofold weight and emphasis. Among educated persons, this native kindness of disposition, being ripened into what looks like a principle, prepares them for sympathizing with the foreigner, and, as a consequence, for holding companionship with him. As I lay upon my couch one day, suffering from pain and debility, I said to a Chinese who was looking at me with an air of concern, ‘When I think of my wife and children, and then of my health, I am unhappy.’ ‘Fear not,’ said he; ‘a good man has nothing to fear.’ The man put himself upon a parity of condition the moment I asked for his sympathy, and uttered a comfortable truth in very good season. He was a heathen, and lived and died so, I am sorry to add. In my judgment, it is a matter of the first importance that we should admit natives, whose salvation we are seeking, to terms of friendship with us.”—(pp. 61, 62.)

CHINESE WOMEN.

“Some have talked about the degradation of Chinese women, and imagined that they had found arguments to authorize an opinion to this effect, in what they saw in transient visits, or heard in conversation while on the shores of that country. Small occurrences sometimes give a different aspect to the matter. On one occasion, while I was living at Macao, the female relatives of the chief magistrate of that place honoured Mr. Beale with their presence. The party amounted to about fourteen, and came with a long train of female servants, all of them, maids as well as mistresses, borne in the capacious and elegant sedans which in China form an admirable substitute for the carriage. Apart from the train of “honourable women” were several well-dressed men, who not only formed the escort, but discharged little offices of attention when necessary. I well remember the act of graceful obeisance with which one presented an elegant pipe to one of the ladies that he had just lighted for her. In addition to the waiting ladies and gentlemen were the insignia of office, the shout of a noisy gang of harbingers, and the din of the far-resounding gong, all which always precede the magistrate himself: in a word, there was nothing omitted to shew that custom allowed the ladies a free participation in all the honorary appendages of office, while the duties thereof were of course confined to their husbands.

“The ladies were handed out of their chairs by their female attendants, and led up the steps by the same hands, the small size of the foot making such assistance by no means superfluous. Their attire was gorgeous in the extreme—the richest embroidery upon the most showy colours; but it formed a striking contrast to the admirable simplicity of their whole demeanour. Not a shade of affectation could be seen, nor could the eye of scrutiny detect any hint to show that they were conscious of the display they were making.”—(pp. 37, 38.)

"A native of the United States married a Chinese female, who had never felt the benefits of education. She followed her husband to America, and afterwards back again to Macao, where a friend of mine paid them a visit. On his return I asked him how she demeaned herself towards her husband. 'With great respect,' was the answer. And this testimony in her favour was not solitary, for the captain who conveyed the pair to the other side of the Atlantic declared he had never met with such passengers before, and that the wife rendered the services of a stewardess unnecessary in the cabin, and with her own hands kept every thing in an admirable state of order and neatness. The story of this female seems to shew that the feeling of respect is a natural gift, and ready, even in the most unfavourable cases, to expand itself spontaneously."—(pp. 36, 37.)

There is as little of the narrow-minded selfishness and false philosophy of Malthusianism in the following excellent remarks, as there was in the heart and head of the inspired penman when he wrote, "As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man, so are children of the youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them."—(Psalm cxxvii.)

LARGE POPULATION OF CHINA.

"The prosperity of the Chinese tempts me to frame a system of political economy, which lays population as the foundation whereon every thing in the way of social comfort and personal affluence is reared. If the valleys and plains be covered with inhabitants, the opportunities of living by the chase, or the spontaneous gifts of nature, are soon reduced, and the soil must be turned over for a crop, and the sea be summoned to yield its finny stores. The necessity of tilling the ground and investing (?) the water with nets prompts men to set about the manufacture of implements of husbandry and the building of boats. Here we have the first germs of art and enterprise. The skill employed in the forging of a spade to stir the ground, or a plough to part the clods, may be diverted into a hundred channels, and ultimately give rise to as many discoveries. The supply of such things will vary as the number of hands, and will be of easy purchase when those hands are greatly multiplied. The wealth of the community grows out of man, and not out of the soil, except in a secondary and subordinate sense. This we see demonstrated in countries where the means of living are secured without industry, for the people have nothing beside.* If the tenants should all on a sudden be so far multiplied that much labour and assiduity were needful to obtain a livelihood, that would prove the birth-day of plenty. I look upon man as the great capital of a nation—a view which is based upon what I see in China, where a swarming people are encircled by a swarm of comforts. In no country do the inhabitants crowd every habitable spot as in China; in no country do the poor people abound with so many of the elegancies and luxuries of life. This abundance in the market tempts the buyer by its low price and its variety; and, in order that he may have the means or money to buy withal, he addresses himself to work with redoubled energy. In China the shops overflow with every thing that can attract the eye or provoke the appetite, all under the more effectual lure of a low price. A native is thus stirred up to industrious habits, not by the iron hand of compulsion, but by the charming hopes of enjoyment. The worth of his money engenders fru-

* "About fifteen years ago a native of the Society Islands might climb a bread-fruit tree, fetch down a living loaf, lay it upon a fire which he had lighted by rubbing two sticks together, and while it was dressing step to the sea-side with a cocoa-nut shell for a modicum of water. Dipped in this dish of nature's sauce, the bread-fruit was as grateful as it was nutritious; but, owing to this prodigality of nature, the islander would not work, so that when the bread-fruit tree failed he was obliged to eat fern root, or any wild fruit that the thickets of the mountain could afford him."—(Author.)

gality, and thus adds a sister grace to industry. The ease with which a family may be maintained woos him to indulge the love of matrimony, and he lays by something to purchase a home, with a beautiful wife to adorn it. Early marriage encourages fertility and augments the population, already vast, and consequently the means of living, which bear a ratio to that population. Thus we are carried round in a circle, and brought back to man, with this benediction, 'Be fruitful and multiply,' as the corner-stone of all the '*foison*' stores of plenty."—(pp. 262—264.)

We regret that our nearly exhausted space admits of our bestowing no more than this flying notice upon Mr. Lay. We however strongly recommend his book to the attention of our own readers. It will be found not only of much intrinsic value, but also truly seasonable in the present juncture of Chinese affairs.

THE LATTER DAYS OF THE JEWISH CHURCH.

By D. M'CAUSLAND, Esq.

(*Second Notice.*)

WE have received a letter from Mr. M'Causland, on the subject of our notice of his work. It is too long for insertion, and yet its temperate and Christian tone seem to claim a few words of reply.

We can assure the writer that our simple object is, as he supposes, "the establishment of Christian truth;" that it is far more grateful to us to praise than to blame; and that it was because we were fully convinced that Christian truth was at stake, we felt it our "duty to protest" against his views. We feel deeply that as Reviewers we are responsible no less for the soundness of our judgment than for the uprightness of our intentions; but we must repeat our firm conviction that the work is a fresh stumbling-block to the faith of the Church.

We declined to enter on the main argument, whether the Apocalypse be or be not all future; because the Author had done the same. The *onus probandi* surely lies on those who depart from the received convictions of the Church, and the general course of interpretation. Mr. M. simply takes that for granted on which the whole depends; and we follow the plain maxim "*cum verbo arguas, verbo satis est negare.*" We are able, we think, fully to redeem our pledge when a fit occasion shall arise.

But Mr. M. "is willing to stake the truth of every word that he has written on that of his position (whether original or not,) that Elijah was the prophet like unto Moses; and the very passage on which we have founded our objection shall establish it." After a short argument to this effect, he subjoins—"I have never met with any person, however prepossessed in favour of the contrary, who has not on careful analysis admitted the foregoing to be the true meaning of the Apostle."

We gladly accept the challenge in this compendious form; and think we shall justify to our readers our former censure, from the Author's own admission; and perhaps re-convince some of our Irish friends, whose zeal for new discoveries may have outstripped their caution and soundness of judgment.

The argument of Mr. M. rests on two premises. First, Elijah is announced by our Lord, as yet to come, and to restore all things, Matt. xvii. 11. Secondly, the connection of St. Peter's discourse, Acts iii. 22, is justly paraphrased thus;—a Prophet, who shall be the instrument of this restitution, &c. The same reference to the times of restitution Mr. M. thinks confirmed by the words "of these days" in the following verse.

Now we agree with our Author upon the first premise, but in every other statement we think him demonstrably wrong. First, if the connection were such as he supposes, it would far from prove his point. It may be true—for ourselves we fully believe it—that Elias, in a subordinate sense, as a messenger of Christ, will restore all things, namely, in the Jewish Church. But it is still more clearly true, and in a higher sense, that our Lord himself is to be the Restorer of all things. The question of the Apostles and our Lord's answer, Acts i. 6, 7, where the same word is used, are conclusive on this point. The question is not—"will Elias"—but "wilt thou restore the kingdom." If we were to allow therefore the supposed connection of v. 22, with the times of restitution, the question would still remain—"Of the two restorers, the Lord himself, and the subordinate messenger, which is more likely to be in the mind of the Apostle—which the more sure to be understood by the Jews as his meaning?—the Lord Jesus, of whom the enquiry, Acts i. 6, was made, and who is the great subject of the discourse?—or Elijah, the under servant, who has not once been mentioned by name, or even alluded to?" Even on this ground alone, there could be no reasonable doubt that St. Peter, by the restoring Prophet, meant the Lord Jesus himself, who is six times named, and of whom his heart was full; not Elijah, who is never mentioned, and of whose future coming, as well as his prophetic character, the Jews were fully persuaded, and needed no confirmation.

But, secondly, the connection supposed by our Author is erroneous, and his Paraphrase, therefore, is unsound. The reasoning of the Apostle is not so weak as to depend on words which have no place in the text he cites, but which are foisted into it to suit an expositor's fancy—"a prophet, who shall restore all things." No, its emphasis rests upon words clearly expressed by Moses himself, "*like unto me.*" The Apostle had asserted two things of Christ, as witnessed by all the prophets; first, that he

should suffer; and next, that he should restore all things at his return. The Messiah, he teaches the Jews, was to be despised and rejected by them at his first coming, and yet finally to bring them full deliverance. For Moses truly says, "A prophet shall the Lord raise up unto you, *like unto me*." In this view, how seasonable and impressive as applied to Elijah, how unmeaning and unapplicable to the hearers, the warning quoted in the next verse, "Every soul which will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people!"

In the third place, we have another conclusive proof that our Lord is referred to, in the following verse. It is the strangest oversight of Mr. M. to allege this in favour of his novel hypothesis, which it utterly destroys. The words, "yea, and all the prophets," shew that the prophecy of Moses (verses 22, 23) refers to the same time as the following verse. And what time is this? St. Peter tells us expressly, "they foretold of *these days*," not of *those days*, or the times of restitution to follow on Israel's repentance; but of *these days*, the times when he was speaking, and when the Messiah had suffered through their perverse rejection (iii. 18). This alone is an absolute demonstration that Elijah is not the prophet here intended, but our Lord himself.

Lastly, to make the evidence still more overwhelming, let us refer to the words of St. Stephen (Acts vii. 35—37). 'This Moses, *whom they refused*, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did God send to be a ruler and a deliverer. This is that Moses which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, *like unto me*; him shall ye hear.' What could be more unmeaning and absurd than for St. Stephen to bring in this prophecy here, if it referred to Elijah? What can be more beautiful than the silent warning which the passage conveys, simply as it stands, without a word of comment, in its true application to the rejected Saviour of Israel?

We have thus fulfilled our pledge, to the conviction, we think, of every unbiassed mind. We hope that the Author will make, as he asks of his Reviewer, "a candid declaration of his conviction on this particular subject." We should be doubly pleased if he were to fulfil his larger promise, and accede to our opinion upon "the truth of all that he has written." But if this be too much to hope for—and from the temperate and candid tone of his letter we do not quite despair, however unripe his critical judgment—we trust that these few remarks will at least serve to our readers as a partial antidote against the pestilence of rash and hasty interpretations.

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1841.

THE BISHOP. *A Series of Letters to a newly-created Prelate.*
London: How. 1841.

It has been transmitted to us as a "true saying," by one who was himself a pattern and a model for all succeeding ministers of Christ, that "if a man desire the office of a Bishop, he desireth a good work." But we are forcibly reminded, by the able volume before us, of the change which the interval of ages has wrought in the office itself, and consequently in the motives which would lead men to desire it. Then, pre-eminence of rank was pre-eminence of peril. If to "rule well were to be accounted worthy of double honour," it was to be exposed also to twofold or to tenfold hardships. Oftentimes to be the Bishop of the Church was to be the leader of the noble army of its Martyrs; and mitre there was none, except the Saviour's crown of thorns. *Now*—but we will not pursue the contrast—it must be sufficiently marked to all who *have* read the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, and who *will* read the present "Series of Letters to a newly-created Prelate."

To the Letters themselves we have no objection to offer. So far otherwise, indeed, that we pronounce them, without hesitation, to indicate considerable powers of mind; and to offer much counsel, respecting the secularities of the episcopal office, which to us who are, and are likely to die as we have lived, of the inferior

order of the Presbytery, seems highly judicious, and would be, if followed by those whom it most nearly concerns, extremely valuable. Who the adventurous layman may be, who has thus "rushed in" (though assuredly no "fool") where clerics had "feared to tread," we have no means of conjecturing; but he tells us (and there is some internal evidence that what he tells us is not fiction), that these are "bonâ fide letters addressed by a lay friend to a recently-appointed bishop," though he adds, somewhat inconsistently, that it was "far from the writer's mind to suppose that advice was necessary to the new prelate." Still, it seems to have occurred to him, that there might possibly be other new prelates to whom, unlike his friend, advice *might* be necessary, and accordingly he has poured forth his admonitions with a laudable prodigality; imitating the Apostle in one respect, that he uses "great plainness of speech," but differing from him, *toto cœlo*, in another—that his counsel is to the Bishop as he *sometimes* is, the "Prelate," the lord over God's heritage;—and not to the Bishop as he *always ought to be*, the shepherd of souls, the overseer and the example of the flock.

Still, though the view which the Layman has taken of episcopal elevation be not only unscriptural in theory, but somewhat exaggerated in fact; though he thinks—what we think superfluous—that it is needful "to enact the part of the slave in the consular triumph, and amidst the pomp and pride and circumstance by which the new Prelate is surrounded, to remind him that he is still but a man," as if there were or could be any danger of forgetting it—still, the book, in its details, is admirably adapted to existing arrangements, though some of its suggestions would apply with greater force to the mere arbitrary creation of ministerial connection or caprice, than to "one who has won his way to the highest honours by the highest acquirements;" one "of whom his station will be proud, not one who will be proud of his station." We do not, indeed, agree with our Author, that "promotion given to simple merit seems to offend everybody;" for we seldom recollect a more general impression of cordial satisfaction than that which attended the recent elevation of the successor of Bishop Otter, whose advancement could not be ascribed either to family interest or political connection, and so far from being "regarded by the world as a matter of course," was hailed as an unexpected triumph of public spirit over party prejudice. Respecting the last episcopal appointment also we have heard no other breath of censure, than that it was not made years before; and that one of the most active and efficient parochial ministers of the metropolis should be placed as bishop in a diocese whose population scarcely more than

doubles that of his former parish.* We only quote these instances to prove, that the Author sets out upon a false assumption. We do not believe that either of these persons recently promoted is or will be "not only envied for raising himself up, but hated for keeping others down." We shall only say, that if the clergy, as a body, are susceptible of such unworthy feelings of envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness—assuredly they are not called forth by the promotion of "simple merit"—by the elevation of such men as Dr. Shuttleworth and Dr. Short, who would have been raised to the episcopate long ago, had the mitre been awarded, as in primitive times, by the suffrage of the Church.

With this deduction or qualification, however, we cannot but admit, that this self-constituted privy-counsellor to the bench of Bishops has most skilfully performed his task; and though his remarks, fully carried out, have a tendency to recognise and therefore to perpetuate some of the most objectionable features of the existing system, yet they are well worthy of adoption and attention, unless, which we rather hope, the system itself should undergo a change. Some change, indeed, and that no slight one, it has already undergone, arising from the quarter which affords most of hope and of promise for the future—the good taste, good sense, and good feeling of the Bishops themselves, of whom not a few seem desirous to revert, as far as practicable, to the primitive character of *primus inter pares*, and, by manifesting fraternal sympathy with the Presbytery, to disarm the envy of which our Author speaks as attendant upon the Episcopate. And if this be the case, when the office is occasionally conferred from motives of political expediency alone, upon individuals whom charity itself, looking back upon their past career, cannot credit with desiring "the office of a bishop," because it is a "*good work*;"—how much more might it be expected, did that change occur in the system to which we look forward with ardent desire, and which would effectually bar the promotion of any but simple merit—the restoration to the Church of that elective suffrage to which she has not forfeited her claim, just because it was first swindled from her by the artifice of an impudent pretender, and then wrested anew from her by the tyranny of an unprincipled despot. The utmost which could be claimed by the civil authority, on anything approaching

* It appears from recent arrangements, that this unfortunate diocese is to become a training seminary for bishops; for what Burns says of nature may be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to more than one English prelate—

"His prentice han' he tried on MAN."

This is dealing rather hard measure to the only diocese in our ecclesiastical system which conforms to the pattern of primitive apostolical episcopacy.

to Church principles, would be the right of ratifying the clerical election—the exercise of a veto, which would be quite sufficient to obviate any political inconvenience from the disposal of the parliamentary suffrage, even did not *that* become a law by enactment, which is now almost a law of custom, that the votes of the Prelates should be only given on questions affecting the interests or the administration of the Church. This would be the best means for securing that course, independent of party, which our Author, in his fourth section, considers becoming in a Bishop, by whomsoever appointed. His remarks on this subject are well worth transcription :—

“ The truly independent course is to act as if party had no existence ; to follow that which is wisest and best in itself, irrespective of the side which makes the loudest claim to the monopoly of goodness. No doubt such a course will often approach, or rather be approached by, the orbit of one party at one time, and the other at another, just as each of them chances to come the nearer to what is really right. Nay more, as each party does possess some truth mingled with its falsehoods, it is perfectly possible to be identified with one of two bigoted and opposed parties on some special question, and to be similarly identified with the other party on a different question. Your Lordship, for instance, may be found thoroughly united with that party erroneously called High Churchmen, in supporting endowments and establishments against the advocates of the voluntary system, and as cordially joined to Dissenters in maintaining the principles of toleration.”—(pp. 47, 48.)

“ When you mix with parties and act with parties, as you must do in the present condition of human affairs, you must remember that you are like a bird in some grove where every twig is limed, and where nets are spread in every open space.”—(p. 52.)

The caution in these words is better than the comparison. Our Author is a little apt to be jocose, and forgets that it is an awkward thing to make the single step from the sublime to the ridiculous, when engaged in reading lectures to the Bench of Bishops on the subject of Episcopal Ethics. Indeed, there are so many Sewellisms, that we should certainly have ascribed the work to that distinguished Professor, had not the preface declared that it was written by a layman, and we think it would form no part of Mr. Sewell's code of “ Christian Morals ” to write even anonymously under a fictitious character. There is much of that happy adaptation of imagery, much of that variety and appositeness of classical illustration, much of that indirect yet most forcible introduction of scripture phrases and expressions which characterise the Professor ; and not a little too, it must be owned, of what is almost equally characteristic, the strength which degenerates into ruggedness, and the familiarity which trenches upon coarseness. We will cite a few examples of the latter—of the former every reader may cull specimens for himself, for they abound in every page.

We have, first, the *sporting illustration*, which would be more appropriately addressed to some of our hereditary legislators than to a "newly-created Prelate :—

"When adversaries meet for the express purpose of being reconciled, they are very apt to slide insensibly into the opposite course, and thus to widen the breach which you are anxious to have closed. *It would be an odd way of preventing a fight between game-cocks to bring them into the same pit.*"—(p. 249.)

A very apposite illustration this, but rather misplaced. Now for the *rustic illustration*, which would better suit his Lordship's gardener :—

"You will often have to make use of the captious, but you must take care not to admit them too close to you, unless, indeed, you are singular in your taste, and *would like a hedgehog for a bedfellow.*"—(p. 216.)

We must not omit the *domestic illustration*, which would be more appropriate to his Lordship's housemaid :—

"It may sometimes be necessary to employ instrumentality when you dislike the instruments. *I have a great dislike to cats, but I keep one in the house because I dislike mice more.*"—(p. 217, 218.)

Again :—

"'Scandalum magnatum' is in these days a passport to the favour of the ignorant multitude. 'Only think,' says each open-mouthed blockhead, 'a private individual has had the courage to step forward and rebuke his lordship.' The courage of such a proceeding is just on a par with that of the dog that bays at the moon, and you should only reply as the moon does, that is, 'shine on.' Always bear in mind, *that if you want to throw a stone at a yelping cur, you will have to stoop for it.*"—(pp. 157, 158.)

There is some excellent advice in the following, though rather strangely expressed :—

"Though on all proper occasions you should claim the deference due to your station, by showing yourself conscious of your rank, there are also proper occasions when you may sink the bishop in the man, and withdraw the restraints of office from yourself and others. It requires some tact, and great knowledge of your company, to discriminate these occasions, and to frame any abstract rule for your guidance would be a sheer absurdity. But it is of importance that you should be either one or the other : you must not mix the characters, or alternate them unfairly. If you begin a discussion with me, merely in your individual capacity, you must not suddenly put on your mitre, and *come bishop over me.* Should you do so, you will weaken my respect for yourself, and you will not increase it for your office." *—(p. 167.)

We come, however, to a passage which is, considering the *το πρεπον* of the episcopal dignity, the most reprehensible in the

* We have seen elsewhere a mode of expression so exactly resembling this,

"Parrots with twin cherries in their beak,"

as almost to ask in one breath, "Is it?" and to answer, "No, it cannot be." Is it the facetious Canon, the joker of jokes, the inimitable Peter Plymley? No, it cannot be, for when was Peter ever serious for more than half a page? We could almost suspect him, however, of having been so far concerned in this work, as that he has contracted to supply the jokes.

book, and one which induces us to believe that it was indeed written by a layman, for the simple reason that no clergyman, we may hope—none assuredly who was competent to produce a work like this—no, not Peter Plymley himself—would have indited such a passage. The Author is speaking of newspaper paragraphs, inserted for the express purpose of eliciting an answer from the bishop:—

“Such traps are set every day by party newspapers and controversial writers, but the birds must be very young indeed that are caught in them. The instances in which any man is bound to notice newspaper reports, or allusions to himself and his writings in controversial works, are exceedingly rare, for a controversy with an editor is like *going to law with a certain sable gentleman, and having the court held in a remarkably hot place.*”—(pp. 188, 189.)

We shall only observe, that though the volume is a work where “*plura nitent*,” yet this is no “*parva macula*,” and we trust it will not be suffered to disfigure the next edition. A writer who volunteers to lecture the Bench of Bishops surely goes to the full extent of licence in taking his illustrations from the kitchen, the barn, the cock-pit, and the dog-kennel; but he should consider that some deference is due to ears episcopal, as well as “ears polite,” and at least let Pandemonium alone.

With this remark we close our censure, and proceed to the more agreeable task of commenting upon the excellences of this little volume. For bishops *as they are* (and we say this with an exclusive reference to their OFFICIAL character and position) it is a manual of most discreet and judicious counsel, applicable to the circumstances in which they must necessarily be placed, and drawn up by one who has a just apprehension of what is due to the world from those who must be *in* it, while yet they are not *of* it. That the book should relate principally to things secular, or to the secular portion of things spiritual, is only becoming, considering the quarter whence it professes to proceed; and if taken in connection with, and *in subordination to*, that better manual which ought to be often in a Bishop’s hand, and never long absent from his remembrance, it would tend greatly to diminish the interval between Bishops *as they sometimes are*, and Bishops *as they always ought to be*. Every Bishop *ought* to be, among elders, a “fellow-elder;” among the younger ministers, an adviser ever accessible and courteous; among the flock, an “example to the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity.” We anticipate therefore for this work a much more extended circulation than its title would seem to imply, for it is just as well calculated to instruct the clergy in what they are to expect from the Bishop, as the Bishop in what he is to render to his clergy; and the sound and sensible view which it exhibits of the episcopal office

and duties may tend to diminish unreasonable claims upon the time and thought of him who, in the present state of the Anglican dioceses, may "give himself wholly to these things," be pressed beyond measure and above strength," and yet leave many things undone which others think he ought, and which he would himself desire, to do. We conclude with the Author's excellent remarks on the "Bishop in private life;" and however some may censure the adventurous wight who has thus presumed to offer counsel to the counselors, and to talk of wisdom to the wise, we think that by those who consider not who he is, but whereof he affirms, he will be found not to have spoken in vain:—

"Your own public duties will be onerous, and my object has been to show how the burthen should be borne, rather than how it may be lightened; but it is not superfluous to direct your attention to the fact, that the weight and extent of these duties must generally interfere with the direction of your private affairs, and the government of your family. I am not going to write a treatise on education, or to investigate the nature of a parent's obligations towards his children: on this head it will be quite sufficient to remind you, that St. Paul enumerates the 'ruling one's own house well' among the requisites for the ministry, and, consequently, that in this respect a bishop should be exemplary. But there are some peculiarities in your case which require to be kept steadily in your view, and to which I shall take leave to advert very briefly. The younger children of the less wealthy peers, and all the children of a bishop, are brought up in a style from which they must expect in after life to descend. Your station imposes upon you the necessity of living in a lordly mansion, keeping a rich table, supporting an expensive equipage and establishment of servants, procuring such masters for your children as consist with your dignity, and mixing with the company suited to your rank. These things end with your life: the change is a great trial, and feeling that it awaits your children, you should carefully train them so that these externals should sit loose upon their minds, and that they should feel within themselves internal resources, both moral and intellectual, of which no change can deprive them. You must remember that their trial will be greater than that of the younger branches of the nobility; the latter retain their high connections, their *entree* into the circles of fashion, the *prestige* of rank and fashion: with your children the change is complete—

Modo, reges et tetrarchas, omnia magna;
Modo sit mihi mensa tripes.

"A bishop ought strenuously to exert himself to leave his children comfortably settled in the ranks of the gentry; but he must remember himself, and he must impress upon their minds, that after his death they will cease to have anything to do with the nobility."—(pp. 319—321.)

"There may be, and there probably will be, some who may regard the mention of this subject as impertinent and useless. They will think of the times, now I trust gone by, when there were prelates who seemed to regard the Church as a kind of estate which was to be administered, not for the general advantage of the community, but for the use of their families. They seemed to take the apostolic injunction, 'If any provide not for his own house, he is worse than an infidel,' by contraries; that is, instead of providing for their children out of their own incomes, by life insurances, and other savings, they left the Church to provide for them. Preferments were heaped upon their sons, benefices were the portions of their daughters; livings were trafficked to procure snug partnerships in business for some

branches of the family. Though such practices have ceased—indeed I have not recently heard of a single instance of barter in episcopal patronage—yet some of the evil consequences remain, and are sufficiently perplexing to a fond and conscientious father. Should you have sons in the Church, you expose them to great and unfair disadvantages, when in the distribution of patronage you pass them over in favour of the better claims of strangers. The world will never understand your scale of measurement. As I already have said, men generally know nothing of the kinds, and very little of the degrees, of qualifications for office; hence they will not easily believe that you passed by your sons because the stranger was *more fit*, but because they were *unfit*; a slur will thus be cast upon their characters, against which it is exceedingly difficult to provide adequately.

“The dread of nepotism must not lead you into the opposite extreme. I have already said, that your most pregnant function lies in the choice of instruments, and assuredly you are likely to work best with those instruments of which you have the most intimate knowledge, and over which you can exercise the most efficient control. All other circumstances being equal, qualities resulting from the relationship, though not the relationship itself, render your son or nephew more eligible than a stranger, especially for a situation to which you must occasionally delegate a portion of your authority. However you decide, you cannot hope always to have the judgment of the world with you; but in this, as in most other difficulties, you must only trust to time, which generally ‘at last sets all things even.’ A more difficult and delicate case arises in the relations of affinity: you will find persons who will look for preferment as part of the marriage-portions of your daughters; the only caution that need be given respecting them is, that they are likely to prove bad clergymen and worse husbands.”—(pp. 324—327.)

THE LIFE OF THOMAS BURGESS, D.D., F.R.S., F.A.S., &c., &c., late Lord Bishop of Salisbury. By JOHN L. HARFORD, Esq., D.C.L., F.R.S. Second Edition. London: *Longman*. 1841.

WHILE we were engaged on the preceding article, the Memoir of Bishop Burgess was laid upon our table, and our critical examination of the “Letters to a newly-created Prelate,” imparted to its pages an additional zest. We delighted in the transition from the secular to the spiritual—from the ‘creation’ of human authority to the Man of God, inly formed and fashioned by a divine influence and power—from the Prelate, a designation which almost contradicts the word of God, to the bishop and pastor, conformed to the perfect pattern of the chief Shepherd and Bishop of our souls. If any thing could reconcile us to a system, which recognizes the intrusion of the civil authority into the disposal of offices strictly spiritual, it would be the occasional exaltation, apart from all personal or political considerations, of such men as the late Bishop—we will not say of Salisbury—but of that see, with which

his name will be for ever associated in the annals of the Anglican Church—ST. DAVID'S.

We do not feel ourselves at liberty, consistently with the plan of our work, to comment at any length upon Mr. Harford's interesting volume, which, though a new edition, is not a new book. We feel bound to thank him, however, for the mode of publication which he has adopted, much preferable to the costly quarto, or the widely-margined and scantily-paged octavo, as far as the great mass of readers are concerned ; and much better suited therefore to the subject of his memoir, who seems through life to have acted on the principle of combining the greatest attainable measure of usefulness to others, with the least possible exaltation and exhibition of himself. We can therefore, *salvâ conscientiâ*, recommend the work to all who would form a right estimate both of what a Bishop ought to be, and what he will be, when, like Bishop Burgess, the dignity seeks him, and not he the dignity ; and when, so far as human judgment extends, the motive for desiring the office, when proffered to his acceptance is, not that it is a great honour, but that it is a "good work." Undoubtedly, Bishop Burgess had both his infirmities as a man, and his deficiencies as a Bishop ; nor does his biographer pass over in silence either the one or the other—but for humility, simplicity, pureness of motive, and guilelessness of heart, the annals of English episcopacy can furnish few equal, and none superior—so that, while we love his memory the better, we do not respect it the less, because he was a man "of like passions with ourselves."

Doctor Thomas Burgess was born in November 1756, at Odiham, near Basingstoke, in Hampshire, where his Father carried on the business of a grocer. At the age of seven years he was sent to the grammar-school of his native place, where he remained till he had "got beyond his master," and in 1768 was transferred to the collegiate school of Winchester, where he continued till 1775. Thence he removed to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, upon a Winchester scholarship which he gained after a severe competition ; and carried with him to the bosom of Alma Mater a much larger stock of classical learning than most of her alumni bear away from it. In the year 1778, before taking his degree, he published a new edition of Burton's *Pentalogia*, which he enriched with an appendix of additional and learned notes, with an improved and copious Greek index, and with an elegant preface. Such a publication, from an undergraduate, attracted much attention ; and emboldened by the reputation thus acquired, he ventured upon that great work, which laid the foundation of his future fortunes, while establishing his newly-acquired fame—the republication of "Dawes'

Miscellanea Critica," with an appendix, little inferior to the volume in bulk, and fully equal to it in erudition. Among other benefits, this publication procured for the writer the acquaintance and friendship of Mr. Tyrwhitt, a gentleman of liberal mind, as well as a scholar of varied and extensive acquirements—who, finding that Mr. Burgess was on the point of leaving Oxford on account of his inability to support the expence of residence, and designing to prosecute his studies in the retirement of a curacy, said with equal delicacy and kindness, "No: you must on no account quit Oxford—you must be my curate here for the next two years." Accordingly, for about that space of time, he received from Mr. Tyrwhitt a pecuniary contribution, amounting to the ordinary salary of a curate. In the summer of 1782 he became Tutor, and in the spring of the following year, Fellow of Corpus, which enabled him to dispense with the assistance of his generous friend; and in 1784 he was ordained both deacon and priest by Dr. Cornwallis, Bishop of Winchester. It is interesting to observe his own subsequent account of this momentous transaction, given in his 79th year, when his biographer ventured to inquire into his actuating motives on the occasion. "At the time to which you refer," he replied, "I was full of that ambition for literary distinction natural to a young scholar circumstanced as I was; but after I had taken orders, and turned my attention to sacred studies, I gradually imbibed deep and serious views of divine truth." It was from the recollection of this, doubtless, that on examining candidates for orders, he was in the habit of "probing not only their proficiency in learning, but their inspiring motives, and the degree and sincerity of their personal piety."

Personal piety, however, whatever it may be in the sight of God, is not essential or conducive to human promotion, and so it was in the case of Mr. Burgess, whose learning and morals—for he was equally conspicuous in both, speedily recommended him to an important station, for which God was afterwards pleased to qualify him by his piety. Dr. Shute Barrington, then Bishop of Salisbury, afterwards of Durham, was desirous of selecting as his chaplain a clergyman of superior worth and learning, and was induced after due enquiry, to apply to Mr. Burgess. This excellent Bishop was himself one of the most striking examples of the inherent defects of the existing system; defects, which were here overruled by the providence of God to the production of His own gracious ends, so that evil was overcome of good. Dr. Barrington, when called to rule over parochial ministers, had never had the charge of a parish himself. Passing with the greatest rapidity through stalls and canonries, he was made Bishop of Llandaff at the earliest possible

age ; and after seven years' probation in the poor Welch diocese of Llandaff, was placed, before he had attained the age of forty, in the important see of Salisbury. "He owed his elevation," says Mr. Harford, "to the interest of his brother, the second Viscount Barrington, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer." How far Chancellors of the Exchequer are competent by their financial and fiscal studies, to exercise the prerogative of apostles, or to represent the various orders of the Church, in the appointment of its most dignified and responsible functionaries, is a question which we have neither limits nor inclination to discuss. In this instance, however sacrilegious the hand by which this "lot was cast into the lap, the disposing thereof was of the Lord"—and His gracious providence gave the Church, in Dr. Barrington, not an Exchequer Prelate, but a Bishop indeed—one who not only remembered that he was a man, but, in the language of our lecturer on Episcopal Proprieties, "strove to be more than a man." To such a Prelate, versed from his infancy in all the windings and subtleties of courts, the simplicity, the guilelessness, the transparency of mind which appeared in the character of Mr. Burgess, would be refreshing indeed. He speedily obtained the Bishop's confidence, because he was worthy to be trusted. He obtained also the Bishop's respect, because with all his modesty and mildness he combined a manly independence, of which an interesting example is given, p. 97. He obtained moreover the bishop's patronage, because he did not court it by servile compliances, or angle for it by inuendoes and insinuations. The terms in which this Prelate expressed himself, when nominating his chaplain to a stall in the Cathedral of Durham, are the best monument that could be reared to the memory of both parties, and we give them, as the best comment on Letter VI. of the series reviewed in the preceding article, "On the Disposal of Patronage."

"It may be matter of doubt, my dear Burgess, whether you derive more pleasure from your preferment, or I from having bestowed it. The thanks of both are due to a gracious providence ; from me, that it has given me the power of rewarding distinguished and unassuming merit ; from you, that you have been the object of my choice. You have obtained the comforts which flow from ease and independence : I, those which result from the consciousness of having acted right ; from the credit of my appointment ; and from the friendship which this connection has produced between us, and which I value amongst the happy circumstance of my life. Be that life long or short, may I, during the remainder of it, never forget that patronage is a trust to be rendered subservient to the great interests of religion and learning."—(p. 169.)

That life was indeed a long one, for it extended to the advanced age of ninety-two, and nobly did the venerable prelate redeem this pledge. Not only Bishop Burgess, but "Gisborne and Paley,

Bishops Sumner, Gray, and Philpotts, Faber and Davidson, Townsend and Gilly, Collinson of Gateshead, and Gray of Sunderland were selected by the same discriminating patron to fill important situations in his diocese. The three last stalls, which fell to his disposal, were bestowed upon persons whom he had never seen, until their useful writings recommended them to his notice." (p. 361.) One such example, duly considered, would outweigh a whole volume of chapters on the disposal of patronage; and well would it have been for the Anglican Church, if there had been no glaring instances as much the opposite of this, as Shylock is the opposite of the Man of Ross, and Sir Robert Walpole of Aristides. Happily, nepotism is no longer the scourge of the Church, though it may be the incubus of a diocese—

" Delicta majorum immeritus lues
——— donec templa refeceris."

But we return to Prebendary Burgess, whose simple and primitive taste caused him, amidst cathedral pomp and circumstance, to sigh for parochial retirement. He requested the Bishop to give him a living of inferior value, and permit him to resign his stall and chaplaincy. One half his prayer,

" Was heard—the rest, dispersed in empty air."

The Bishop gave him the living, but would not accept the resignation; and for seven years, as Rector of Winston, he enjoyed the quiet usefulness which his deepened sense of religious feeling and the responsibilities of the pastoral office had led him to prefer even to the great object of his early ambition, learned ease. He sought no further preferment, but preferment sought him. Mr. Addington, then Premier, who was with Burgess both at Winchester and Oxford, expressed his surprise that his old schoolfellow did not call upon him—the Bishop of Durham told Dr. Burgess of this, and recommended him to call;—but such was his repugnance to the appearance of courting patronage, that he did not profit by this hint; and when he mentioned it to Mrs. Burgess after his return from London, and she very naturally exclaimed, "Then of course you called in Downing-street"—he replied in the negative. "She tacitly," continues the biographer, "acquiesced in his decision." We really think that, on this occasion, the lady, if possible, merits the higher praise;—she deserved to be, what she afterwards became, a Bishop's wife.

The sequel shall conclude our notice. *O si sic omnia!* "About a fortnight afterwards, as Dr. and Mrs. Burgess were sitting together, the post came in; and among various letters which it brought, Mrs. Burgess called his attention to one franked by Mr.

Addington. 'Some friend,' he replied, 'must have asked him to frank a letter to me;' and he put it aside for the moment, not having the slightest suspicion of its contents. Mrs. Burgess, who soon after left the room, observed on her return that he looked grave and thoughtful, and inquired the cause, when he shewed her the following letter from Mr. Addington:—

"Downing-street, June 5th, 1803.

"SIR,—Though we have been separated almost thirty years, I have not, let me assure you, been a stranger to the excellence of your private character, nor to your exertions for the interests of learning and religion; and I have been anxious that your services should be still further noticed and distinguished, and your sphere of being useful enlarged. These considerations alone have led me to mention you to his majesty as the successor of the late Lord George Murray, in the diocese of St. David's, and I am happy to say that his majesty has entirely approved of the recommendation. It will not be expected that you should relinquish your prebend in the cathedral Church of Durham.

I have the honour to be, with true esteem, Sir,

Your most obedient and faithful servant,

HENRY ADDINGTON."

We hardly know whether it would have been more grateful to be the writer or the receiver of such a letter. As if, however, our objections against "Exchequer Bishops" were to lose nothing of strength even from such an appointment so conferred, "Some idea existed," says the biographer, "that Mr. Addington would have given the vacant bishopric to a learned divine in the North, long since dead, an old friend of Burgess and a worthy man, but pompous and pushing. One who knew them both observed, in allusion to this report. "It was well he did not give it to Dr. ——— he would have died of inflation. It is best bestowed on that humble apostolical man."

It *was* indeed. Not being versed in the scandal of the day, who Dr. ——— was we do not know and have no wish to inquire, but who Dr. Burgess was, and what he accomplished for the diocese of St. David's during an episcopate of twenty-two years, will be gratefully commemorated while the Church of England shall exist. For a succinct account of this, and for such extracts from the "Sacra Privata" of this good man, as will not only prove the fact that he was, but elucidate the process by which he continued to be, an apostolical bishop, we refer to the work itself, which excels the subject of our former article, just as far as one fact outweighs a thousand arguments. Had Bishop Burgess died, as he had lived, Bishop of St. David's, his reputation as a primitive bishop in days when translation was unknown would scarcely have yielded even to that of the venerable Wilson—as it is, we must rejoice, that there is *ONE* action in which none of his successors can imitate him. Translations—mere mercenary translations—

translations to diminished usefulness but ampler emolument, have been the reproach of our Church in ages past—we cannot but be thankful that they can no longer be so in time to come. We do not indeed impute to Bishop Burgess any such unworthy motive ; but even his partial biographer observes :—

“ Much surprise and regret were expressed at the time in various quarters, that he should have been willing to part from his Welch diocese, and perhaps it would have been more to his happiness had he steadfastly adhered to his ancient station.”—(p. 334.)

It would have been more to his honour—more to the advantage of the Church—more to the glory of his Master. In acting as he did, indeed, he was influenced primarily by regard for the health of the person most dear to him, who suffered under severe rheumatic affection, which she ascribed to the dampness of the Palace of Abergwilly. But we wish he had not done it. “ One thing thou lackest,” is now the inscription on *his*, as on the monumental stone of almost every benefactor to mankind. Yet, with every deduction for the one thing he did, and the many things he left undone, it must still be said of Bishop Burgess, that he has taught those who shall come after him a twofold lesson—first, in what purity a Bishop should live, and then in what peace a Christian can die !

SERMONS *preacht in Herstmonceux Church.* By JULIUS CHARLES HARE, Rector of Herstmonceux, Archdeacon of Lewes, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: *Parker.* 1841.

THE learned and able Author of these discourses is already before the public by several previous labours of his pen. The translation, in conjunction with the present Bishop of St. David's, of Niebuhr's celebrated history, and the ingenious little volume of “ Guesses at Truth,” have introduced him to a large circle of readers. Called successively, since then, to the duties of a country incumbency, and more recently, as Archdeacon of Lewes, to a still more responsible office, his later publications have been of a deeper kind, and stamped with the sacredness of thought and feeling which befits those who minister to the sanctuary. His Charge was lately noticed in our columns, and the volume of University Sermons published by him in the previous year, is marked by a vigour,

freshness, and scriptural power of thought which are very rarely combined.

The present volume, as its title implies, differs in some measure from the former in its immediate object; but the glowing eloquence of the writer, the classical turn of his thoughts, and the imagery, almost redundant, which seems their instinctive and spontaneous expression, make the distinction less in reality than seems to have been the Author's design. The University Sermons were indeed marked by peculiar excellence. Sound in doctrine, spiritual in feeling, with a Saxon simplicity and graceful elegance of style, the strangeness of their orthography and their occasional grotesqueness of phrase seemed only to enhance their animation of effect and general interest. Those before us, viewed as designed for a rural congregation, are perhaps not so fitted for their peculiar object, and scarcely rival the homely and impressive plainness which has been justly admired in the sermons of his lamented brother. The Author's mind seems too flowing, too luxuriant in its intellectual riches, to attain fully that simple style of address which appears suited for such hearers. But when allowance is made for this defect, little remains for the province of a reviewer but unmingled praise. Our only resource is to select a few extracts, by which our readers may be led to a perusal of the whole.

The first sermon is on the passage of St. James, "Draw nigh to God." The second is on the great subject of conviction of sin, the first step in the approach of the returning sinner. We shall extract a few paragraphs from its close:—

"Jesus Christ came as a deliverer: and who will welcome and rejoice in a deliverer, unless he knows that there is something from which he needs to be delivered, unless he feels that he is in a wretched galling bondage, and that he cannot of himself burst his chains, that he cannot throw off his yoke? But when a man's eyes are opened to see the prison in which he is shut up, to see and feel the chains which are fast bound round his soul, and have eaten into it,—when he has learnt to see and to know that the pleasures, whatever they may be, of sin, are only, like the flesh-pots of Egypt, intoxicating drugs, given to him to deprive him of all sense of his captivity,—then will he long for a deliverer, and rejoice on hearing of his approach, and hail him when he comes into view, and follow him whithersoever he may lead.

"This, my brethren, is the reason why the Scripture is so careful to conclude all mankind under sin,—in order that the eyes of all may be opened to perceive their wretchedness and helplessness, and that all may rejoice with exceeding joy at the coming of Him who has come to deliver them. Unless we had been brought to acknowledge this, we should never have cared for the blessed gifts of salvation and redemption. Unless we had been taught that the natural growth of our hearts is idle and poisonous weeds, the heavenly seed of God's word could never have sprung up and borne fruit in them. Supposing a field were overgrown with all manner of rank weeds, what would you do? Would you leave it just as it was, and merely throw a few handfuls of seed over it? If you were to do so, would the seed sink into the ground, and spring up, and ripen? and would you reap a crop of corn

from the midst of the weeds? Would you not rather begin by chopping up the weeds, and clearing the ground of them, and burning them? But to do this, you must know beforehand that they are mischievous weeds; else you would let them remain. In like manner is it needful that you should be thoroughly aware how the natural growth of your hearts are noxious deadly sins, that you should be aware how you are overgrown and overrun by sin, and how sin is the parent of death and of endless misery, in order that you may be fitted for receiving the promise given through faith in Christ Jesus to them that believe.

“ And as that promise is offered to all, as the blessed gifts of redemption and salvation are held out to all, if they will only have a lively faith in Him who brings them, therefore was it necessary that all should be concluded under sin. All are concluded under sin, to the end that all may receive the promises of the gospel. Those promises are given to sinners, to such as feel and faint under the burthen of their sins, and long to be releast from them. They who deem themselves righteous care not for the promises, and trusting that they can save themselves, turn away from the heavenly Saviour.

“ From what has been said, you may form some notion what a depth and fulness of meaning is contained in the text. It sets forth the fallen nature of man, and the merciful counsel of God, by which man, after he had forfeited the realities of an earthly Paradise, was called to the inheritance of a heavenly and eternal glory. But this is not all. The text likewise sets forth the way in which the fulfilment of the promise is to be obtained—by faith. This is the way, and the only way. As unbelief is the one great universal sin, in which all mankind are concluded—as this is the source and ground of all other sins—as it is only from having let slip our faith in God, that we have yielded our hearts to the temptations of the world, and given ourselves up to its idolatries,—so on the other hand it is only through faith that we can be brought back to God,—it is only through faith that we can receive the promise given to those who believe. In the invisible God, man had proved that he could not believe. The senses were too strong for him: he could only believe in that which he could see and handle. Therefore God, in compassion to our weakness, vouchsafed to appear upon earth in a visible human form, so that we might believe in Him whom we had seen with our eyes, and heard with our ears. This is the one great condition of our salvation, faith in Jesus Christ, a living, growing, hallowing faith. This was the one condition, which our Lord, when He was on earth in the flesh, required from all such as He was to heal from their bodily infirmities: and this is in like manner the one condition on which the promises of the gospel are given. They are given through faith in Jesus Christ to those who believe, and to them only. You must feel and acknowledge in the first instance, that you are indeed by nature concluded under sin, that by nature you are shut up in the bondage of sin, and cannot escape from it: and then you must believe heartily and earnestly, that Jesus Christ, the eternal only-begotten Son of God, is able and willing to deliver you from your sins, and to restore you by the working of His Spirit to that blessed inheritance of holiness and godliness for which you were made. You must believe this earnestly, heartily, with a hearty yearning for this deliverance, with a yearning that shall make you seek for it diligently and patiently by self-denial and instant prayer: and then that faith, which is able to move mountains, will shew its wonder-working power by removing the mountain of sin from your souls. You must be persuaded that this world, and this mortal life, so far as they wrap themselves up in their own darkness, and wall themselves in with their own wilfulness, excluding the light of God's truth, are indeed no better than a prison of abject misery. You must endeavour to raise your eyes above the walls of this prison, to fix them on something beyond. You must acknowledge that, while your souls are turned away from God, and from the path of His laws, you are *sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, being bound in affliction and iron*. And then, if you cry to the Lord in your trouble,

He will deliver you out of your distresses: He will bring you out of darkness and the shadow of death, and will break your bonds in sunder. For already He hath broken the gates of brass, and cut the gates of iron in sunder. Only believe that He has done this; believe in Jesus Christ who has done this; and then you will feel that you are no longer shut up in a dungeon, that you are no longer concluded under sin. You will rise up and hasten to follow the Captain of your Salvation, who has redeemed you from the prison of sin, and who calls you to come forth into the glorious liberty of the children of God."—(pp. 32—35.)

Very important is the great truth unfolded in the above passage. Nearly every form of false doctrine by which the Church of Christ is troubled, whether Socinian heresy, or Popish and semi-Popish superstition, may be traced to ignorance of this first principle of true and genuine religion. Its root will be found in that pride of heart, which would come with some price or other in the hand to purchase the free gift of God. A humble heart, a broken and contrite spirit, is the best of all preservatives against heresy and schism. On the other hand, where this is wanting, the soil is ready for the weeds of every superstitious delusion. A secret Pelagianism in the heart, we cannot doubt, lies at the root of those false doctrines which are now troubling the peace of our own Church. Nor can her members find any preservative so full and complete as a heart moulded into genuine sympathy with that deep confession which forms the fit preface of her daily service.

The following paragraph, which is the close of the fifth sermon, appears too allegorical, and involved in historical allusion, to be quite plain to common hearers. In other respects, the thought is beautifully expressed, and forms a happy sequel to the previous subject:—

"Tell ye the Daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh to thee! What a glad sound is this to the afflicted, broken-hearted mourner, if he can but be brought to listen to it, and to believe it! if he can be brought to believe that the Prince of this world, whom he has hitherto served, is a usurper, and not the rightful king of Sion; if he can be brought to believe, that, even though the Prince of this world should seem to belong to the house of Judah, even though there may seem to be something like religion mixt up with his natural life, and holding a kind of sway over him, still this is only a puppet set up by the world, as Herod was by the Romans, who, the lords of the earth, were the real masters of the land. Let a man be brought to acknowledge this, and further to acknowledge, that the Sadducees and Pharisees,—the worldly thoughts, and the thoughts of a formal outward religion, of a religion of acts and observances,—between which his heart is divided, are both of them sheer hypocrites and deceivers, that feed him with chaff instead of bread, and with sour wine instead of good wine; let a man be brought to acknowledge this; and he will indeed rejoice to hear that his King is coming to him. His heart and soul will cry Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest! The world, which he has hitherto deemed the only world, and the best and most precious of all possible worlds, will split before his sight, and fade away: and in its place will come forth a new world, like the new heavens and the new earth seen in the apocalyptic vision. And this new world will not need the light of the sun, nor the

light of the moon. He will no longer worship the powers of nature : he will no longer give up his heart to them ! he will no longer feel any need of earthly joys to turn his darkness into light. For the glory of God will lighten him ; and the Lamb will be his Light."—(pp. 93, 94.)

The Sermon on Good Friday is powerful and impressive. We have not room in our narrow limits for more than one further passage, and we would pray that its spirit may be impressed more and more deeply on the whole Church and family of God. The discourse is on those simple words, "Jesus bowed his head and gave up the Ghost," and closes with the following earnest appeal :

"This is the great choice which is set before you in this life. Sin would murder you : Christ would save you. Yea, Christ alone can save you ; and unless he does save you, Sin will destroy you. Therefore are you not only to hate and loathe your sins, but to shun them and cast them from you, to fear them, not so as to crouch beneath them, but so as to guard against them. You are not to fear them, as though they were too mighty for you, seeing that Christ has conquered them in your behalf. But having such a Leader, such a Captain, such a Bulwark and Tower of Strength, you are to fight against them boldly and undauntedly. He who died on the Cross to take away your sins, will strengthen you to fight against sin ; and in His strength you shall overcome it. Do you need a motive, an encouragement, an assurance, that you may fight against sin ? Whatever you may need, you have everything in Him who gave up the ghost as on this day on the Cross. It should make you hate and abhor sin, to see what a foul abomination it brought to pass. It should make you fear sin, to see what terrible might was in it, how it unhinged the whole order of the world, turning the highest things into the lowest, and bringing down the Lord of power and purity to suffer the death of a criminal. It should make you fight against sin bravely, trustfully, hopefully, to know that you have such a mighty Helper, a Helper who bore such love to you, that He underwent all that shame and suffering patiently, meekly, of His own will, on your behalf, for the sake of the reward set before Him, in the redemption of your souls from sin and misery to everlasting life and joy ; and who, you may therefore be sure, will not leave His work imperfect. Above all, should the thought of such surpassing love constrain you to do everything, to bear everything, for the sake of Him, who has done and borne so much for you.

"When our Lord gave up the ghost on the Cross, *the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom ; and the earth did quake ; and the rocks rent ; and the graves were opened ; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose.* In this way did even things without thought and feeling bear witness to the awful terrors of that moment. And shall we, my brethren, for whose sake all these sufferings were endured, regard them unmoved ? Can we behold our Saviour on the Cross, without feeling the veil of darkness, the crust of sin, which covers our hearts, rend in like manner asunder ? without finding our carnal nature quake, and the hardness of our hearts burst, and the graves in which our better yearnings were imprisoned, open, and every nobler and purer and heavenlier feeling rise and come forth ? When any of you find yourselves assailed by any temptation to sin, think of Christ crucified. Think of all the sufferings that He bore, of the agony that he went through for you. Can you think of all this, knowing who it was that bore these sufferings, and why He bore them,—can you think of those sufferings, my brethren, and of Him who bore them, without feeling your hearts burn within you,—without shuddering at the thought of the sins by which you yourselves were a cause of those sufferings,—without being bowed to the ground by shame and pity and unutterable thankfulness ? Can you think of all these things, and still go on sinning ? Surely none in the form of men can be such

stocks and stones, as to be unmoved by the sight of such sufferings and of such love. It is because we do not think of these things, that we go on sinning; because we do not fix our hearts on the thought, and keep it steadily before our minds, but turn away from it the moment we get out of hearing of the preacher. Accustom yourselves to this thought, I beseech you; accustom yourselves to think of Christ crucified, not once a year, when Good Friday comes round, or now and then on a Sunday, but daily and every day. When your heart is waxing faint, think of Christ crucified. When any strong temptation comes across you, think of Christ crucified. When the world is smiling and fawning upon you to beguile and ensnare you, think of Christ crucified. When sorrow and affliction are galling you to repine and murmur against God, think of Christ crucified. Think of that Cross of Christ, by which the justice of God was magnified. Think of that Cross of Christ, on which the holiness of God became surpassingly holy. Think of that Cross of Christ, on which the mercy of God shone forth in its purest glory. Think of that Cross of Christ, by which Satan was put to the rout. Think of that Cross of Christ, by which sin and death were conquered. Think of that Cross of Christ, by which the gates of hell were burst open. Think of that Cross of Christ, which has now been lifted up into heaven, and from which a voice of unimaginable love calls you to come to the abodes of everlasting bliss. Surely, if you did but think of that Cross, with a full and lively faith in the wonders wrought thereon, your hearts and souls, and all that is within you, would break forth into the cry of the angelic host: *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing!*"—(pp. 169—172.)

We cordially recommend the whole volume to our readers, and rejoice to see high talent and classical learning devoted to their noblest use, and laid as an unreserved offering upon the altar of the Most High.

A FEW MORE WORDS IN SUPPORT OF No. 90. By the Rev. W. G. WARD, M.A. Oxford. 1841.

"*Ye worship ye KNOW NOT WHAT*"—was the censure which our Lord himself passed upon the Samaritans;—while "*we know what we worship*" was the commendation he claimed for the Jews. "*I will pray,*" says the Apostle Paul, "*with the spirit,*" "*and I will pray with the UNDERSTANDING also;*" for "*I had rather speak five words with my understanding, than ten thousand in an unknown tongue.*" "*That the eyes of your understanding may be enlightened,*"—is the same Apostle's prayer for the Ephesian Church. It is needful sometimes to call such texts to mind, inasmuch as the Romish doctrine of "implicit faith" is again springing up among us. We heard, some time back, of an eminent and universally-respected divine, who, in the spirit of sincere, candid, and honest enquiry, visited one of our universities for the purpose

of ascertaining, by personal conference, what were these new views respecting which he heard so much discussion. His character, as we have already said, would have sufficed to ensure him a respectful reception anywhere; but beyond this he could gain nothing. His object was, to *understand* before he either approved or condemned. But his enquiries were repelled as partaking somewhat of profane intrusion into unrevealed mysteries; and he left the place, at last, nearly as much in the dark as to what the apostles of the new system really advocated and asserted, as he was when he first entered it. We need hardly say, that this obscurity could not be removed by the study of their publications, inasmuch as it was for the purpose of ascertaining what the ambiguities in their written works really concealed, that his visit was paid to the authors themselves.

One topic on which their favourite "mystery" is brought into full use, is that which is handled in the works named at the head of this article; and our endeavour will be, if possible, to strip this cloak quite away.

We deny not, nor cavil at, the existence of mysteries in religion. They inevitably exist, as a result of the utter disparity, the immeasurable distance between a finite and an infinite mind. Wherever God has left any subject, distinctly revealed, but not lowered to human understandings, there it is our duty to believe in silence. But it is quite possible for the same persons to be forward in explaining what the All-wise has not explained, and equally forward in fabricating mysteries where He has made none. Those who, on the one hand, ventured the lengths of the Athanasian creed, in defining and describing the mode of the Divine Existence; and yet made a "great mystery" of the Lord's Supper, left us a notable example of this kind of inconsistency! Not that we quarrel with any one of the statements in that creed; only remarking, that it goes to the utmost allowable extent in dogmatic definition. But certainly, of the two, we should think it far wiser and more safe, to endeavour to understand with some precision, the real nature of a rite of which we are constantly partaking,—than the mode and manner of the joint and yet distinct existence and operations of the Holy Trinity.

The subject, however, of what is termed "The Real Presence" is a favourite one with the lovers of mystery. In truth, it must be mysterious, or it must be nothing. It is a dream; and to be touched, and handled, and shaken, dissipates it into thin air. Hence nothing can be more natural than that its advocates should insist on our believing, without attempting to understand, it. We admit, readily, that it must be so believed, if it is to be

believed at all. Accordingly, Mr. Froude objects alike to the Protestant and the Romish statements. Of the first he says—

"If the words, 'Sign of my body' are understood to convey any idea *more definite and intelligible* than that which is conveyed in our Lord's own words, then most certainly that idea is unscriptural, it is a mere human invention, fabricated to set the mind at rest, *where God has seen fit to leave it in uncertainty.*"—(p. 52.)

Of the other, the Romish—

"Unlike the Protestant glosses, this does not attempt to explain away everything miraculous in the history of the Last Supper; but by explaining precisely *wherein* the miracle consisted and *how* it is brought about, it aims, like them, at relieving us from a confession of ignorance, and *so far must be regarded as a contrivance of human scepticism*, to elude the claims of faith, and to withdraw from the hidden mysteries of religion the indistinctness in which God has thought fit to envelope them."

Here we find the Lord's Supper classed among those "hidden mysteries" which God has thought fit to envelope in obscurity, and which it is scepticism to endeavour to understand. We question the truth of this position.

But perhaps the reader's mind will carry him back to the Communion Service, in which we are told, that "Christ hath instituted and ordained *holy mysteries*, as pledges of his love," &c. It will be necessary, therefore, to say a few words concerning two very distinct senses in which the word "mystery" is used.

The first and principal sense of the word, as used in Scripture, is that seen in 1 Tim. iii. 16:—"Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh; justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." And, as applied to works of darkness, as well as to works of light, in 2 Thess. ii. 7, "The *mystery of iniquity doth already work.*" Thus used, it implies some grand movement in the invisible world, some mighty plan, whether of the Father of Mercies, or the Great Enemy of mankind, which is too vast and too inscrutable to be easily or wholly understood by the human mind. Clearly it is not in *this* sense that the term is used in our Communion Service.

But there is another meaning, a lower and conventional one. We find it, not in Scripture, but in history. For instance:—

"There is nothing in all the Pagan antiquity more celebrated than feasts of Ceres Eleusina. The ceremonies of this festival were called, by way of eminence, '*The Mysteries.*' They were divided into the less and the greater, of which the former served as a preparation for the latter. The less *were solemnized* in the month Anthesterion, which answers to our November; the great in the month Boedromion, or August. I shall principally consider the great, which *were celebrated* at Eleusis." *

* Rollin's Ancient History, book x. ch. 3.

A "mystery," here, we see, means simply a religious feast or ceremony, which the priests chose to involve in darkness and secrecy, admitting only certain initiated persons, after satisfaction given to themselves.

It appears to us an unhappy circumstance, that this heathen sense of the word was, long after the Apostles' time, imported into the Church. "We shut the doors," says Chrysostom, "when we *celebrate the mysteries*, and we keep out all uninitiated persons from them." Here we see a plain copying from Paganism. And Bingham thus accounts for the adoption of the word in this sense, and for the purposes of which what was called the *Disciplina Arcani* was also borrowed from Paganism.

"As to its original, the learned Albaspinæus has rightly observed, that, in the apostolical age, and some time after, they were not so very strict in this discipline of concealing their sacred mysteries from the knowledge of the catechumens, for he thus argues against the antiquity of the book called the Apostolical Constitutions:—'The last words,' says he, 'which forbid the publication of those eight books, do plainly shew that they were not written in the first age: for the Christians of the first age did never make any scruple of publishing their mysteries, as appears from the writings of Justin Martyr.' Mr. Aubertine observes the same out of Athenagoras and Tatian; and Daille joins in opinion with Albaspinæus, and cites his authority with approbation; and Basnage is so far from thinking that the apostles concealed their mysteries from the catechumens, that he rather supposes they administered the sacraments in their presence. Upon which supposition the whole fabric, which Schelstrate builds upon the *Disciplina Arcani*, is ruined at once; for then it is certain, the apostles had no such fear or caution upon them, lest the catechumens should come to the knowledge of the Christian rites or doctrines, as is pretended. And, indeed, any one that looks into the writings of the apostles, may perceive, with half an eye, that they were far enough from concealing their opinion about the worship of angels, saints, and images, for they expressly write against it; and when they speak of the mysteries of baptism and the eucharist, they do it with the greatest freedom, without any fear or apprehension of giving offence to the catechumens." *

And again:—

"As to those things which they really concealed from the catechumens, the true reasons were, first, that the plainness and simplicity of the Christian rites might not be contemned by them, or give any occasion of scandal or offence to them, before they were thoroughly instructed about the nature of the mysteries. For both Jews and Gentiles, out of whom Christian converts were made catechumens, were apt to deride the nakedness and simplicity of the Christian religion, as void of those pompous ceremonies and sacrifices with which those other religions abounded. The Christian religion prescribed but one washing in water, and one oblation of bread and wine, instead of that multitude of bloody sacrifices, which the other religions commanded. Therefore, lest the plainness of these few ceremonies should offend the prejudiced minds of catechumens, before they were well instructed about them, the Christian teachers usually adorned these mysteries with great and magnificent titles, such as would convey noble ideas to the minds of men concerning their spiritual effects, but concealing their other names, lest simplicity of the things should offend them. When they speak of the eucharist, they

* Bingham's Christian Antiquities, book x. ch. v. pp. 379, 380.

never mentioned bread and wine, but 'the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ;' and styled baptism 'illumination and life, the sacrament of faith, and remission of sins;' saying little, in the meantime, of the outward element of water. This was one plain reason why they denied catechumens the sight of their sacraments, and always spake in mystical terms before them."^{*}

Our readers cannot fail to perceive how entirely distinct and almost opposite is this system from that of the Apostles. It was nothing else than a plagiarism from the Greek worship. It essayed to rival the old religion, heathenism, by offering to its votaries similar attractions. A modern writer says:—

"The last hopes of the ancient religion (of Greece and Rome) lay in the Mysteries. Of them alone the writers about the time of the appearance of Christianity speak with uniform reverence, if not with awe. They alone could bestow happiness in life, and hope in death." "It may be questioned, whether the Mysteries did not owe much of their influence to their secrecy, and to the impressive forms under which they shadowed forth their more recondite truths."[†]

But now let us turn to the gospels, and to St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, and see what was the real character of the Lord's Supper as at first instituted.

St. Luke after describing the last passover partaken of by our Lord, says, "*And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.*"—(Chap. xxii. 19, 20.)

And St. Paul, appealing to a direct revelation, says, "*For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.*"—(1 Cor. xi. 23—26.)

Here is a plain and simple narrative, with nothing mysterious about it. Nor do the early Christians treat of it in any other way.

Justin Martyr, in the second century, thus describes the mode in which the rite was used in the Christian Churches of his day:—

^{*} Bingham's Christian Antiquities, book x. ch. v. p. 392.

[†] Milman's Hist. Christ. vol. i. p. 31.

"On the day which is called Sunday, there is an assembling together in one place of those who live in towns, or in the country around; and the histories and writings of the Prophets and Apostles are read, as time may permit. Then the reader ceasing, the president (or elder) exhorts all to the imitation of those good things. Then we all rise and offer prayers, and when the service is finished, bread and wine and water are offered, and the president again offers prayers and thanksgivings, and the people say, 'Amen.' And the communication and distribution is to each of those who have returned thanks."

The "mystery," therefore, plainly crept in afterwards, when the clergy, rising in honour and estimation, began to set up Christianity as, in some sort, a rival to Paganism, and,—to draw the rich and the great over to their side,—decked out the simple gospel in shewy garments, to allure and dazzle the gazer's eye. But let us pass on to the question now at issue. The apostle's remark is merely this natural and obvious one, "*As oft as ye eat this BREAD, and drink this CUP, ye do SHEW (set forth or exhibit) the Lord's death, till he come.*" The disciples were to set before their own eyes, and the eyes of each other, from time to time, under the forms of broken bread and poured wine,—the broken body and the shed blood of HIM by whose stripes they were healed. And thus a "perpetual memory" was kept up, of the grand central truth of the Christian system.

But this was far too plain and simple a transaction for those who panted for the same spiritual domination over their followers, which the priests of the heathen had exercised over theirs. They began, therefore, soon to speak of their "mysteries," as the pagans had lauded theirs. But to make them high and mysterious enough, it was necessary to call the bread and wine "a sacrifice," and themselves, sacrificing priests. Still, however, if the bread remained bread, and the wine, wine, there could be nothing very awful or mysterious in the transaction. Soon, therefore, a higher flight was taken, and the bread and wine, after consecration, began to be regarded as having undergone some wondrous and mysterious change. As this was something of which the senses had no perception, it was necessarily assumed to be a matter invisible, inexplicable, and, of course, "mysterious."

And this is just the present position of the question, in certain sections of the English Church. The same causes are again producing the same effects. A similar desire to be regarded with unusual awe and veneration by the multitude, is causing some of the clergy of the Church of England to advance the pretension, that they, and they alone, "have the power of *making* the body and blood of Christ."

But of course these persons, so astonishing their followers, must

expect to be asked, exactly *what it is* that they mean? They have been so asked, again and again, but their replies to the question are in the highest degree vague and unsatisfactory.

If they asserted, that, on the words of consecration being used, a positive and miraculous change took place in the bread and wine; and that they were really and actually, though invisibly, changed into the body and blood of Christ,—this would be Transubstantiation, or the doctrine of Romanism: But they deny that they hold any such doctrine.

Again, if they held, that on the utterance of the words of consecration, the body and blood of Christ became really present, *within* and along with, the bread and wine, that would be Consubstantiation; another error, which they distinctly repudiate.

What is it, then, that they do actually hold? Let Mr. Newman himself tell us:—

"It may be asked, what is the meaning of saying that Christ is really present, yet not locally? This is the point I was coming to, and I will now make a suggestion on the subject. What do we mean by being *present*? How do we define and measure it? To a blind and deaf man, that only is present which he touches; give him hearing, and the range of things present enlarges; every thing is present to him which he hears. Give him at length sight, and the sun may be said to be present to him in the daytime, and myriads of stars by night. The *presence* then of a thing is a relative word, depending in the popular sense of it upon the channels of communication between it and him to whom it is present; and thus it is a word of degree. Such is the meaning of presence when used of material objects; very different from this in our conceptions is the presence of spirit with spirit. The most intimate presence we can fancy is a spiritual presence in the soul; it is nearer to us than any material object can possibly be, for the body which is the organ of conveying to us the presence of matter, sets bounds to its approach towards us. If, then, spiritual beings can be brought near to us, (and that they can, we know from what is told us of the influences of Divine grace, and again of evil angels upon our souls,) their presence is something *sui generis*, of a more perfect and simple character than any presence we commonly call local, meaning by *local* bodily. And further, their presence has nothing to do with the degrees of nearness; they are either present or not present, or, in other words, their coming is not measured by space nor their absence ascertained by distance. In the case of things material, a transit through space is the necessary condition of approach and presence; but in things spiritual (whatever be the condition) such a transit seems not to be a condition. The condition is unknown. Once more: while beings simply spiritual seem not to exist in place, the Incarnate Son does; according to our Church's decision already alluded to; that 'the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here, it being against the *truth* of Christ's natural body to be at one time *in more places than one*.'

"Such seems to be the mystery attending our Lord and Saviour: He has a *body*, and that *spiritual*; He is both in place, and yet, as being a Spirit, His mode of approach, the mode in which He makes Himself present here or there, may be, for what we know, as different from the mode in which material bodies approach and come, as a spiritual presence is more perfect. As material bodies approach by moving from place to place, so the approach and presence of a spiritual body may be in some other way,—probably is in some other way, since in some other way (as it would appear) not gradual,

progressive, approximating, that is, locomotive, but at once, spirits become present,—may be such as to be consistent with His remaining on God's right hand while He becomes present here,—may be real yet not local, or in a word, is *mysterious*. The body and blood of Christ may be really, literally present in the Holy Eucharist, yet not having become present by local passage, may still literally and really be on God's right hand; so that, though they be present in deed and truth, it may be impossible, it may be untrue to say that they are literally *in* the elements, or *about* them, or *in* the soul of the receiver. These may be useful modes of speech according to the occasion; but the true determination of all such questions may be this, that Christ's body and blood are *locally* at God's right hand, *yet* really *present* here,—present here, but not here in place,—because they are spirit." *

"What they do say is, that Christ's body is present, but they do not know *how*; it being a mystery, as I have said already, how it can be really present yet not locally or as bodies are." †

"But without limiting Christ's presence to the consecrated elements, it seems nothing but the truth to say that they are the immediate antecedents of Christ; so that He who in faith receives them, at once, and without assignable medium, is gifted with His presence who is on God's right hand. As the breath is the immediate forerunner of the voice, as the face is the image of the soul, as a garment marks a bodily presence, so, I conceive, the elements are the antecedents of His body and blood, or what our Article calls, the 'effectual signs (efficacia signa), by the which He doth work invisibly in us,' or, as Hooker calls them, His 'instruments.' And hence, whereas He is unseen, and His presence ineffable, and known only by its outward signs, we say, when we take them, that we take the awful realities which follow on them; when we touch the one, we touch the other; when we eat the one, we eat the other; when we drink the one, we drink the other. For the same reason we call them by the name of those antitypes which they image and convey. We apply to our approach to the sacred gift all words, but those of sense; we do not literally say, we feel or see the body and blood under the outward signs, for, strictly speaking, what we see is bread; but as taste and colour are the evidence of the presence of that material substance of bread which we do not see, so the bread, thus evidenced to our senses, is the token of that adorable body which we do not see. Touching or eating are not, nor are used in theology, as words appropriate to the senses. When we feel the bread with our fingers, we touch the body; when we taste the bread with our lips, we eat the body." ‡

Another illustration of the same point may be found in a little poem of Mr. Hawker's, in the volume, called *Ecclesia*, of which we recently gave a short notice, it runs thus:—

EPHPHATHA.

I.

"High matins now in bower and hall!
It is the Baptist's Festival:
What showers of gold the sunbeams rain,
Through the tall window's purple pane!
What rich hues on the pavement lie,
A molten rainbow from the sky!

* Newman's Letter to Dr. Faussett, pp. 53–56.

† Ibid. p. 60.

‡ Newman's Letter to Dr. Faussett, pp. 61, 62.

II.

" But light and shadow loveliest fall
Yonder, along the southward wall,
Where ceased, even now, the chaunted hymn
Of that gray man, whose eyes are dim :—
'Twas an old legend, quaintly sung,
Caught from some far barbaric tongue.

III.

" He asks—and bread of wheat they bring—
He thirsts for water from the spring,
Which flowed of old, and still flows on,
With name and memory of Saint John :—
So fares the pilgrim in that hall,
Even on the Baptist's Festival!

IV.

" ' How sad a sight is blind old age !'
Thus said the lady's youthful page :
' He eats—but sees not on that bread
What glorious radiance there is shed ;
He drinks from out that chalice fair,
Nor marks the sunlight glancing there !'

V.

" ' Watch, gentle Ronald, watch and pray !
And hear once more an old man's lay :—
I cannot see the morning pour'd
Ruddy and rich on this gay board ;—
I may not trace the noonday light,
Wherewith my bread and bowl are bright,

VI.

" ' But thou ! whose words are sooth, hast said,
That brightness falls on this fair bread ;
Thou sayest, and thy tones be true,
This cup is tinged with heaven's own hue ;
I trust thy voice—I know from thee,
That which I cannot hear nor see !'

VII.

" ' Watch, gentle Ronald ! watch and pray,
It is the Baptist's Holy Day ;
Go, where in old Morwenna's shrine,
They break the bread, and bless the wine,
There, meekly bend thy trusting knee,
And touch, *what sight can never see !*'

VIII.

" ' Thou wilt behold—thy lips may share,
All that the cup and paten bear ;
*But life unseen moves o'er that bread—
A glory on that wine is shed ;*
A light comes down, to breathe and be,
Though hid—like summer-suns from me.'

IX.

“ ‘ Watch, gentle Ronald ! watch and pray,
 Day oft is night, and night is day !
 The arrowy glance of Lady fair,
 Beholds not things that throng the air ;
 The clear bright eye of youthful page
 Hath duller ken than blind old age ! ’

X.

“ ‘Tis even song in bower and hall
 On the bold Baptist's festival,
 The harp is hushed, and mute the hymn,
 The guest is gone, whose eyes are dim,
 But evermore to Ronald clung,
 That mystic measure, quaintly sung ! ”

Once more, in Mr. Ward's recent pamphlet, 'now before us, what is called "the Mystical Offering of the Eucharist," is thus treated of.

“ The Catholic doctrine of the Mass or Eucharistic Sacrifice (to speak only of points on which all Catholics agree) is, that the fruits of the One Sacrifice once made on the cross are in a special and peculiar sense impetrated by the Church for the living and dead, through the Mystical Offering of the Eucharist. Now, to call this formally inconsistent with, or derogatory from, the doctrine of the atonement, is simply unmeaning ; as much as to speak in that way of the necessity of faith, or works, or Baptism, to salvation. When persons consider these latter as appointed instruments or means for applying to individuals the blessings purchased by our Lord's death, reasonable men, however they may differ in opinion, never speak of them as denying or tending to deny the atonement. Of course to say that the *thought* of the Atonement is obscured in the minds of most men, and practically put out of sight by a certain line of teaching, is quite another thing ; but in such passages as the following, Cranmer and Ridley seem speaking of *doctrine* : Cranmer. ‘ The papistical priests have taken on them *to be Christ's successors*, and to make *such an oblation and sacrifice as never creature made but Christ alone.*’ ‘ If *only* the death of Christ be the oblation sacrifice and price *wherefore our sins are pardoned*, then the act or ministration of the priest cannot have *the same office.*’ (p. 280.) Ridley. ‘ To speak of this oblation, *how much it is injurious unto Christ's passion*, how it cannot, but with high blasphemy and intolerable pride be claimed of any man,’ &c. It is common charity to these prelates to suppose that they did not rightly understand what the doctrine was against which they felt themselves at liberty to use such unbridled language. Nor is this misconception so unnatural as at first sight may appear. Not only would the popular belief of such miracles as those mentioned in the Tract, pp. 48, 9, make the multitude of men naturally prone to consider it a repetition of the One Sacrifice, but the not uncommon language of theologians, speaking of it as one and the same with the Sacrifice on Calvary, might tend to encourage a similar idea among the ruder sort, or at all events might give Protestants wrong notions of what the real doctrine was.

“ The decree of Trent itself ‘ Una eademque est hostia, idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, *sola offerendi ratione diversa,*’ might be easily misunderstood but for the words immediately following, ‘ Cujus quidem oblationis *cruentæ inquam, fructus per hanc incruentam uberrime percipiuntur.*’ The Reviewer adds that Cranmer, ‘ as if foreseeing Mr. Newman's quibble says, ‘ the Papists to excuse themselves, &c.’ May I be allowed to make rather a longer extract, which begins with the passage

quoted in the Review. 'The Papists to excuse themselves do say, that they make *no new sacrifice nor none other sacrifice than Christ made*. . . . And here they run into the foulest and most heinous error that ever was imagined. For if they make every day the same oblation and sacrifice for sin that Christ made, . . . then followeth it of necessity, that they every day *slay Christ and shed his blood*, and so be they *worse than the wicked Jews and Pharisees*, which slew Him and shed His blood *but once*. Almighty God . . . banish all such darkness and error out of His Church,' &c. So writes the 'Father of the English Reformation: 'whatever other feelings may rise in the mind of the religious reader on perusing the passage, this is plain that he altogether misunderstood the sacred doctrine he opposed, and was even in his own despite, in this instance at least, preserved from any direct 'fighting against God.'"

Is it possible for any thing to be more vague, shadowy, or unsatisfactory than this? and the worst part of the affair is, that these writers evidently wish it to be so. They do not aim to be explicit—they do not appear to wish their readers to understand them. To leave the question in doubt, to constitute it "a mystery," is apparently one part of their object.

But there is no scriptural warrant for so treating the question; nor is it the part of a wise man to create mysteries where God has created none.

The language of our Church is distinct and explicit. It is couched in terms which shew that the writers really meant to be understood:—

"No adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

Here we have both a positive and a negative statement. 1. "The natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are *in heaven*." 2. They are "*not here*." Surely it is scarcely possible for language more explicit to be used; yet some writers still insist upon it that "the Church determines, as I have already said, that the body of Christ is in some mysterious way, though not *locally*, yet *really* present, so that we after some ineffable manner partake of it. Whereas then the objection stands, Christ is not really here, because He is not locally here, she answers, He is really here, yet not locally."

This sort of equivocation, of believing and not believing, can only be supported by a supposition that our Lord has *two* bodies, a "natural" and a "spiritual" one. For when it is distinctly said that the "natural body is in heaven and *not* here," it is cer-

tain that the *same* body cannot be "here" and "*not* here" at the same time. All such representations, therefore necessarily involve a belief, that, in some way or other, there must be two distinct bodies, the one present, the other *not* present.

We are sorry to be compelled thus to deal with these sacred things. But the fault is not ours. Why cannot the matter be left where the Bible leaves it,—where the Church leaves it? The undesirable investigation into which we are driven, arises wholly from the deleterious novelties which are now being urged upon the Church. No one who reads the passages we have quoted above, can doubt that there is far more conveyed and taught in them than the bible teaches, or than Justin teaches, or than the Church teaches.

The presence of Christ spiritually, at the administration of the Lord's Supper, no one questions; but it is of that kind which was promised in the words, "*Where two or three are met together, there am I in the midst of them.*" This, however, will not suffice for the new school of divines. They inculcate "a real presence of Christ's *body*,"—they claim a "power of *making* Christ's *body*." Then, advancing such pretensions, is it too much to ask them to let us know, with some degree of explicitness, both what it is that they mean by these expressions, and by what authority they justify them?

A WINTER IN THE AZORES, AND A SUMMER AT THE BATHS OF FURNAS. By JOSEPH BULLAR, M.D., and HENRY BULLAR, of Lincoln's Inn. London: *Van Voorst*. 1841.

THIS lively and entertaining, though occasionally somewhat too flippant volume, is heralded on the title-page as the joint production of a brace of brothers, to whom we may apply the classical description of inseparable friends,

“ Qui duo corporibus, mentibus unus erant.”

For there are no variations of style, or manner, or sentiment, by which we may distinguish between the student of Coke-upon-Littleton, and the disciple of Æsculapius. The book is a very amusing, and we doubt not a very accurate description of the group denominated the Azores, or Hawk Islands, which geographers have been sometimes inclined to reckon as belonging to Europe, yet about which Europeans, or at least Englishmen, knew less, until the publication of these volumes, than about many of the remotest clusters of the great Southern sea. A “History of the Azores” was indeed reviewed in the *Quarterly* for 1814, “a fair and full-sized quarto, hot-pressed, cream-coloured, and dedicated to the Earl of Moira, by Captain F. A., of the light dragoons,” but the colour within is rose, and the valiant captain's charger seems to have run away with his veracity. “It is a bombastic fiction,” says the bilingual author, the literary Janus of the work before us “founded on a few facts, somewhat amusing when read on the spot, from the cool impudence of the writer, who takes for granted in every page the enormous gullibility of his readers.”

As we have no present prospect of visiting the spot, we must content ourselves with the amusement to be derived from the volumes now before us, which, if not always unexceptionable in quality, is at least abundant in measure, and sometimes superlative in degree. Our comparative ignorance of the persons and things described may possibly have quickened our relish; but this ignorance it seems, is, and therefore this relish will be, “participated in by a large class of persons, ecclesiastical as well as civil, within the compass of her Majesty's dominions. For example, a clergyman, formerly appointed to the chaplaincy of these islands, on taking leave of his diocesan—a learned bishop, since dead, one of the most “learned” on the bench, was stopped at the study-door with the question, “One moment, my good sir, you will pardon

my ignorance ; but pray where *are* the Azores ? ” Similar examples of ignorance are exhibited by our authors in the persons of a grey-headed traveller, a young lady, an old officer in the Peninsular campaign, and a respectable seller of St. Michael's oranges, which last “ learned Theban ” believed that the letters first went to Lisbon by steam, and then were forwarded to St. Michael's overland. “ As this seemed unsatisfactory,” continues our author, “ application was made to the General Post Office in St. Marylebone, when the man at the shutter, in his pert jack-in-office way, answered, slapping to the slide, “ The Azores are not in *our* list.”—(p. 231, vol. i.)

The brother-travellers, twins in authorship if not by birth, left Cowes on the 12th of November, in a tight and fast-sailing schooner, built expressly for the orange-trade, which was making her first voyage, commanded by a captain who was traversing for the fiftieth time the same unvarying course. The 6th of December saw them safely landed at St. Michael's, the oranges of which island are well known, if not itself. On the 7th, the travellers, though one was an invalid, went to a ball, and on the 9th, being Sunday, to the Protestant Episcopal chapel, where they rendered considerable assistance in making a congregation, the whole number in the Church being twelve, out of from one to two hundred English in the place. From this it would seem, at first sight, but too manifest that Christianity and commerce have little connection ; but, they continue, “ This is the market-day and more business seems to be going on among the tradespeople than on any other day of the week, in short, there is as little appearance of religion, as in a Protestant country on week-days, or as in Hyde Park or the Zoological Gardens on fine Sunday afternoons.” We must not, therefore, speak too severely of Sabbath desecration among the Romanists, when the authors can only find a parallel for it by coming back to England. Protestantism in name and Romanism in fact, are but, after all, upon a par.

Though very frequent reference is made to the state of religion in these islands, it must be gathered from incidental sketches, rather than any systematic description. Our authors paint with equal liveliness and humour, whether they use the pencil or the pen ; and their outlines of the rural clergy, though improved, as they tell us, by the artist, must have been executed on the spot—they are the letter-press embodied and impersonated, as this again is itself a portrait to the mind. Who can read, without almost realizing, as though he were present at it, the following scene :—

“ We came across another funeral procession to-day, and followed it to the grave-yard. The ceremony partook of the same careless unconcern which

characterised the procession the other day. The priests, who stood in rows on each side of the body, twanged out their parts like so many frozen-out gardeners in the streets of London. One of them held a large gilded crucifix, and his attention was completely divided between carrying it in such a way as might least incommode himself, and protecting two lanky tapers, which guttered by his side, from the draughts which caused them to flare. Another, who in figure, carriage, dress, and face resembled a dropsical Portuguese woman, after he had finished his part of the chant, took snuff, and hastily blew his nose, that he might be in time for the next stave. Next to him was a lean old man, gaping like a defunct oyster, whose thin cheeks, long hooked nose, and shallow eyes, reminded me strongly of the skulls of some birds. This old gentleman took the service very easy—just as old staggers at public dinners do the cheers—by merely opening his mouth into the shape it would have assumed had he imitated his neighbours. The priests moved off in knots of three or four, giggling as they went, and glad to be released; and last of all the sexton, a merry fellow, who had no feeling of his business, with a handful of extinguished tapers, and a white cup of holy water, cleared the ground of the few children who lingered in it, shut the iron gates, and walked away.”—(vol. i. p. 177.)

We have in the second volume a still more graphic account, if possible, and rendered more interesting by the power of contrast. We are reminded, as we look upon it, of the hand which could better have realized the scene on canvass than any of mortal man;—one over whom the broad wave of the Mediterranean now rolls, and of whom we may say with the poet:—

“ Nothing of him that doth fade.”

“ The clerk lighted and dealt round six lanky tapers to the men in gowns, held one himself, handed the greasy mass-book and the water-brush to the priest, and putting down that functionary’s hat between his legs, stood erect, crucifix in hand, prepared to say the responses. The priest muttered through the prayers within three minutes, while the taper-holders, twisting round and about to save their tapers from the draughts of wind that threatened to blow them out, grinned and jested with the bystanders at the straits in which they were placed. The holy water, in a broken and bandaged white pipkin, was handed to the priest, who ended by dipping into it his small white brush, and freely sprinkling the corpse. The body was lowered; three idle children, sitting on the heap of fresh mould, amused themselves by rolling the earth upon the body. The people talked; the clerk threw away the holy water, as if it were nothing worth; collected his tapers, hastily blowing them out, lest the parish wax should be wasted; the priest walked behind the grave-yard gate, pulled the surplice over his head, lowered the black gown down to his feet, handing them to the clerk in return for his hat; and making a mean jest on the old woman, “ who was much more quiet now than she had been down yonder” (pointing to the village), shook himself into his short blue jacket and turned up the lane. The only person at all affected or serious at the burial was a middle-aged, docile-looking man, probably the son of the deceased, who shed a few unfeigned tears while the grave was filling, and stood for some time gazing on the spot, and thinking, perhaps, that he had never felt the value of a mother till she came to be laid in the grave.”—(vol. ii. p. 135.)

Such being the loose and perfunctory manner in which the Azorean clergy perform church offices, we shall hardly expect to find the laity very exact or precise in their attention to church-

duties. They are, however, both priests and people, very particular in regard to confession, which is to the Romish Church what the doctrine of justification by faith is to the Protestant—*articulis stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*. On the regular practice of this, by all persons above seven years of age, the "blind guides" insist, and they who are led by them into the ditch dare not disobey. Though a grave matter, however, in itself, they treat it, according to our authors, lightly enough.

"This is the time for general confession. A woman, who came to-day with a sick child (had the doctor added the little words, *to me*, we should have identified the scribe), had just returned from making a clean breast in the principal church. She confesses once a year; others confess twice; others three times: and those, she said, who were 'very good,' four times. I asked her what questions the priest put to her. She laughed, hesitated, and at length said, that he inquired whether she was faithful to her husband? what lies she had told in the last twelve months? what she had stolen, and of whom? whether she had slandered others? and how often she had cursed and sworn, or called on the 'diabo?' All this she told him, I fancy, without mental reservation, and appeared light-hearted and relieved."—(vol. i. p. 202.)

The clergy in these islands, though vowed of course to celibacy, are little disposed to regard the obligation. "The whole body," says our author, "openly break a vow which we Protestants think they have no business to make." He gives the following ludicrous description of one of these holy fathers, and his domestic arrangements:—

"In our walk yesterday we were accosted by a slip-shod friar. His dress did not indicate his order. He wore a dingy linen jacket, reddish-brown fustian trowsers, the extremities of which were tucked into the tops of old Wellington boots, with a hat of high antiquity, now napless and rusty; and his mouldy-looking beard, joined with a moist oystery eye, and a nose of intemperate tendency to red, called to mind the Spanish proverb, that 'There's many an old cloak that covers a good drinker.' In his sitting-room were a few books, a well-used Breviary in four volumes, one or two Latin prayer-books, an almanack, and a Portuguese work on Christian morals. A snuff-coloured cloak hung in flabby folds from the same peg with his hat and sea-green umbrella; and below it a gallon flask of wine stood on the floor, with a goodly tumbler to drink it from. It had been made by his own hand from the grapes raised in his own garden, and was the best island wine I had tasted in St. Michael's. He poured it out from the flagon with a liberal hand, and with the expression of one who loved good wine, *comme fait tout homme de bien*. He inquired, with a sort of incredulous expression, whether the English believed in Jesus Christ—in the Holy Spirit—in the conversion of St. Paul? and looked surprised when he was told they did. He asked if we had confession? and on the reply being made, 'Yes, to God, not to priests,' he took his Breviary, and at once referred to the texts which he considered confirmatory of his views of confession, and of the authority of St. Peter's successors. Our interview ended in a sturdy attack from the friar on the unlawfulness of marriage among the English clergy, pronounced with amusing gravity; and as the fact could not very well be denied, and he appeared to slight St. Paul's comparative approval of the marriage state, we ventured, good-humouredly, to remind him of the Catholic padre in the square, with his pleasant housekeeper and family of young children."—(vol. i. pp. 228—231.)

This was a home thrust indeed, and must have smitten the Goliath of Romanism under the fifth rib. It appeared, from the evidence, willingly tendered, of Da Costa with the cucumber face,—an old man who well remembered an event ante-dated seventy-three years, “that as for the priests, each one was a *cœlebs* in search of a wife, and the difficulty of finding one was not great—that the padre of the village had one wife, but the curate had had many, and she whom he then had was not his wife”—

“*Naturam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurret;*”

And what God ordained, and St. Peter practised, how can his self-styled successor abrogate?

It is more than time, however, that we close these remarks. We should have been glad to have culled a few choice specimens of Azorean manners, Azorean wit, and Azorean sentiment—we must be content with one of each, which will, we think, be sufficient to recommend an application to the volumes themselves for a more abundant supply. First, as to manners:—

“The politeness of the people here is very striking to an Englishman. A countryman will hardly pass you without taking off his hat, even when his load may make it a real inconvenience to him; and as there is a serious composure about their courtesy, and an apparent absence of servility, these recognitions seem like tokens of goodwill. The custom is to bow to every lady you see, whether you know her or not. The quantity of bowing necessary in making a call is ludicrous enough. First of all we must bow to the people in the balcony while we are in the street, then again on rapping at the door; another obeisance at leaving, repeated at the bottom of the staircase to the mother, who stood above on the landing-place ready to receive it; and a final salutation to the daughters in the balcony, when we were again in the street. All this is done with as much serious composure as if people were bowing and crossing themselves at mass.”

Secondly, as to wit:—

“Our vessel, the dullest sailor afloat in the Atlantic, is called, by one of those solecisms so frequent on shore, where the dirtiest row and nastiest court are called Paradise and Nightingale, ‘The Flower of Fayal.’ The islanders, who are not ignorant how faded a flower she is, and who, like the Azoreans in general, are happy in nicknames, know her only by the no less figurative phrase of ‘The Scull of a Jackass.’”

Thirdly, as to sentiment —

“The fuchsia is wild in this valley in many of the cottagers’ hedges. The Azoreans call it ‘The Tears of Venus.’”

If amusement is desirable, which shall excite the mind without leaving a sensation of unprofitableness behind it, we scarcely know how it could be presented in a more agreeable form than these lively volumes, which, for this purpose, we cordially recommend. If, on the one hand, there are occasional instances of levity, of which we could have desired the absence, there are, also, indications of deep thought and religious feeling, which are far above

the ordinary standard of tourists; and we close with one of these, which will abundantly prove, that the two individual intelligences who compose the single Author of this volume, just as the two respectable functionaries who are joint Sheriffs of London constitute only a single Sheriff of Middlesex, are not less gifted with power to profit than to please.

“ To an invalid, one of the advantages of change of climate is the hope that it constantly supplies him with of amendment

‘ We see by the glad light,
And breathe the sweet air of futurity;
And so we live, or else we have no life.’

As for the notion of making the most of and enjoying the present, is it not contrary to the very constitution of our natures?—for as the child places his happiness on boyhood, so does the boy on manhood, and the man looks forward to some resting-place on the ladder which he is climbing as the point of happiness; and as he reaches that, to one step above; and then, as his hopes vanish one by one, and his vain or absurd expectations are disappointed, he hopes for a purer ray, a more serene enjoyment. Happy are those who have always had this principally in view; a deep under-current, upon which other hopes merely floated, like loose weeds or flowers in a perpetual and pure stream.”—(vol. ii. p. 226.)

**HEAT: its Sources, Influence, and Results.* London: *Religious Tract Society.* 1841.

BRITISH BIRDS. London: *Religious Tract Society.* 1840.

“ That this Society be denominated the Religious Tract Society; the object of which is the circulation of small religious books and treatises, in Foreign countries, as well as throughout the British dominions.”—*First General Rule of the Religious Tract Society.*

WE have a decided objection to masked batteries, whether literal or literary. We do not at all like to be within range of them ourselves, and we have *almost* as great an aversion to employing them against others. In hardly any circumstances are they fair and honourable engines of warfare. At the outset therefore of this article, instead of speaking soft words by way of introduction to hard blows, like old Homer’s heroes, or modern prize-fighters

“ Who first shake hands before they box,
Then give each other plaguy knocks,”

we announce that we are about to advance grave charges against the Institution whose first general rule we have quoted above.

* This paper was not purposed by the Editor; but it is the voluntary contribution of a country clergyman. Several of its remarks have so much of truth and importance that we cannot throw them aside.

For many years of its existence we were amongst the number of its most zealous advocates, and most ardent admirers, and we still rejoice in the good which it is doing both in our own and in distant countries. Thus much by way of wadding to our shot, and now for a regular volley.

We charge the Religious Tract Society with having abandoned, of late years, much of the simplicity and oneness of object which so happily characterized its earlier proceedings. To speak still more explicitly, we charge it with having departed, in two most important particulars, from the principles of its constitution as set forth in the rule already referred to. That rule defines the object of the society to be "the circulation of *small religious* books and treatises."

Here are two distinct conditions laid down—first that the "books and treatises" circulated by the society shall be "*small*," and next that they shall be "*religious*." Now we take it for granted that its most zealous advocate will concede that the former of these conditions has not been observed—that by no latitude of meaning, where there is any meaning at all, can such books as "The History of the Church," in six duodecimo volumes, or "The Commentary on the Bible by Scott and Henry," in six octavo, come under the denomination of "*small*." In these instances, then, one of the fundamental principles of the society has been directly violated. But the force of our objection may be attempted to be turned aside by representing the objection itself as captious and frivolous. "What," it may be said, "can it signify whether the publications of the society be small or large, provided they are worthy of commendation in other respects. If we can sell or otherwise circulate, *large* religious works, why should we not? Are we not thereby fulfilling a plain Christian duty?" To this we answer that the question is one, not of duty in the abstract, but of duty with reference to certain prescribed limits. The *Tract* Society cannot put into circulation *large* works, however excellent, without infringing upon the charter of its constitution; and to assert that it has violated that charter, is to bring not a frivolous but a substantial charge against it.

But there is in truth much more in the objection than has yet been made apparent. We fearlessly assert that in embarking in the publication and sale of voluminous literary works the society so far forfeits its distinctive character. No longer an institution simply for sending forth amongst the poor those little "messengers of mercy" which have often proved valuable auxiliaries to the Christian minister and to the word of God itself, it becomes a great bookselling establishment; entering

into competition with private enterprize—not unfrequently deadening its energies from the hopelessness of contending with an antagonist which has at command a store of eleemosynary contributions; resorting occasionally to the not very honourable expedient of “getting up” books which materially interfere with property by detracting from the value of copyright; and maintaining a great number of clerks and other salaried officers at an expense which must be covered either by the profit upon the sale of publications, or by the free offerings of the charitable. Surely, surely an institution such as this did not enter into the conception of those good men who originally founded “the *Tract Society*,” and gave it, in their simplicity, a name so little indicative of its present lofty growth and pretensions.

Now to tell us, by way of reply to these charges, of the good which the Society has been instrumental in accomplishing, by the wide circulation of its books, is little better than to assert that the end justifies the means, a doctrine which we trust never to see admitted into the ethical code of any of the great religious institutions of our land. Until, therefore, the Society has received the sanction of its members and contributors at large to a total change in its constitution—that is, until it has ceased to be “the Religious Tract Society, established for the circulation of small religious books and treatises,” and has become something perfectly different, proposing to itself a new object, adopting a new name, and governed by a new law, many of its present proceedings are altogether out of character, and, we are persuaded, incapable of justification.

Let us pass on to consider whether the Society be not chargeable with another and a still more lamentable departure from its professed principles. Its distinctive appellation is the “*Religious Tract Society*,”—its object, as expressed in its rule already quoted by us, “the circulation of *religious* books,” &c. Has then this object been kept steadily and consistently in view from the period of the Society’s formation to the present time?

Before answering this question we would observe that that only can be called a religious book, the main design of which is to inculcate the truths of pure religion, or in other words the vital doctrines of the Book of God. Works written with any different end may partake more or less of a religious character, but postponing as they do, and as they necessarily must, the most important of all subjects to some other, with no propriety of language can they be described as religious books.

And here it may be permitted us to observe, that we totally disapprove of that intermixture of secular and religious

matters which distinguishes many of the educational schemes of the present day, and which especially marks so large a portion of the elementary books composed for young people. Let religious instruction and secular instruction have each its proper place—let them receive that degree of attention which is due to their relative importance, but let them not be mixed up and confounded together to the almost certain injury of both. We trust the day is coming when this subject will be better understood. We even venture to think that it is not very distant.

Be this, however as it may, we unhesitatingly affirm that a book in which the reader's attention is directed chiefly or prominently to subjects of a secular nature, while religious matters are thrown into the back ground—in which religion occupies the second place, while to something perfectly distinct is allotted the first,—such a book cannot be classed amongst works which, and which alone, the Tract Society professes to circulate.

This, then, clearly understood, we return to the inquiry, has the Society faithfully redeemed the pledge given at its first formation, and annually renewed ever since, to its friends and the public?

Truth compels us to answer this question in the negative.

The books, the titles of which we have printed at the head of this article, are the two latest of a series which has been for some time in progress of publication. Every unit in this series may be appealed to in support of our assertion. Let us take for example the book entitled "HEAT, its sources, influence, and results." Considering what we have in hand, a somewhat closer examination of this "treatise" may be advisable than its intrinsic importance would justify.

Here then we have a fine, gilt-edged, perhaps somewhat tawdry book, intended, it would appear, for the use of children. On the cover is to be seen a glowing device, resembling nothing in nature that we are acquainted with, unless it be a full blown wig stuck on the top of a pavior's hammer, but which we may presume from some remote connection between a volcano and the subject-matter of the work, is designed to represent the former. On opening the volume the eye rests upon a really beautiful wood-engraving which forms the frontispiece, and is described thus, "Travellers resting at noon." Interspersed throughout the succeeding one hundred and ninety-six pages are fifteen other engravings, executed in a similar style, and with equal care. We think it worth while to furnish a list of these—"Spring"—"A Tropical scene"—"Indian Cottage"—"Storm in the Pyrenees"—"*Ice-bergs*"—"The Winds"—"*Polar Scene*"—"The Geysers"—"The Railroad"—"The Water-spout"—"Autumnal Morning"—

"The Iron-mine"—"Mount Etna"—"The Ship on Fire"—"The Earthquake." By the way, are not the two which we have marked in italics rather curious illustrations of "Heat"?—justifiable however, we suppose, upon the "*lucus a non lucendo*" principle. It will at once be perceived that there is nothing in any of these splendid ornaments either of religion, or of religious allusion. There is, however, much to gratify and delight the sense of sight, and if such were the compiler's object he has succeeded to a marvel. We should, however, like to put two questions to the committee of the Tract Society—first, what proportion of the 3s. 6d. which the purchaser is required to pay for this book goes to cover its external bedizenings and its internal decorations?—and secondly, have the donations and subscriptions to the Society any relation to the confessedly low price at which these elaborate ornaments are sold?

It is time that we proceed to the *printed* material of the book. Having furnished our readers with a list of its engravings, we next set before them the table of contents. "I. Importance of Heat to Vegetable and Animal Life." "II. Sources of Heat." "III. Sources of Heat continued." "IV. Expansion of Solids by Heat." "V. Expansion of Aeriform Bodies by Heat." "VI. The Thermometer." "VII. Conduction of Heat." "VIII. Radiation of Heat." "IX. Discovery of Latent Heat." "X. Ebullition." "XI. Evaporation." "XII. Capacities of Bodies for Heat." "XIII. Solar Phosphori and Combustion." These divisions of the subject are then treated of in due order. It seems almost needless to observe, that the volume begins with the first and ends with the last. But we wish to give our readers a clear and full conception of the character of the work, and therefore we deem it quite to the purpose to inform them that such is the case—that "Heat," in the various branches into which the author or compiler has seen fit to portion out his treatise, is *the staple* of the work, from page one to page one hundred and ninety-six. Now what, we ask, has all this to do with the inculcation of religious truth? The work, as a work of science, may be ably executed, or the contrary. We care not one sixpence which. But this we are sure of, that it has no pretensions to the honour of being exposed for sale in the depository of the Religious Tract Society, or of being catalogued amongst its publications.

Still the inquiry will doubtless be raised—"Is the book utterly destitute of religious sentiment—are no religious reflections or allusions to be met with in any of its pages?" Gently, friend, we have not so affirmed. Religious sentiment, or something like it, does occasionally discover itself, but in such afflicting circum-

stances, dragging along as it were awkwardly and unwillingly, like a slave in the train of some imperious leader who has the matter all his own way, that we should gladly have it divorced from such humiliating companionship. The book would, in fact, in our judgment, be materially improved by the omission, in future editions, of the religious matter altogether. We think it decidedly the most objectionable portion of the volume—calculated, from the unseasonable moment, and at the same time the timorous dastardly manner in which it squeezes itself in, with a “I hope I don’t intrude” kind of air, to raise an invincible prejudice against itself. We would strongly recommend parents, and teachers who may have purchased or otherwise procured the book for the use of their young charge, to score through all the religious reflections, and leave the affair simply and exclusively what it professes to be—a treatise on “Heat,” and nothing but a treatise on “Heat.”

But that we may not be charged with bringing “a railing accusation,” incapable of proof, against either the book itself, its publishers, or its compiler, we proceed to justify our remarks by one or two quotations.

Take, then, the following. An attempt is made, in chapter the first, to explain the nature of heat, which in the end leaves the matter pretty much where it found it. The writer thus closes this first division of his labours:—

“If it be admitted that heat is a fluid, its chief results are easily explained. Thus, in the warming of any body, we may imagine it to be so formed as to allow heat a ready passage, while in other instances there may be a resistance to its progress. On this supposition, bodies expand when heated, because the fluid enters and separates the particles, driving them more and more asunder, until the solid becomes a liquid, as when ice is changed into water, and the liquid becomes a gas—as when water, on boiling, passes off in steam. If heat is not a substance it must be a quality, and this quality can only be motion. In this Sir Isaac Newton supposed it to consist, but to his opinion there are many and serious objections.

“Here, then, let us learn a lesson of humility! The pride which many display proves they can have no true knowledge. The more we attain, the more shall we see that much remains unknown, as the prospect widens in proportion to the traveller’s ascent of the hill. Humility prepares us to advance in human learning; nor can we, without it, become acquainted with the things of God, since Christ has said, ‘Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.’ Mark x. 15. With entire submission to his divine authority, then, may every reader be found sitting, like Mary, at the feet of Jesus.”

Let the words, “to learn what is the true nature of heat,” be supplied, by way of continuation, to the last sentence of this passage, and the absurdity of the scriptural allusion will be instantly apparent.

Again:—

“ Fahrenheit, a native of Dantzic, who afterwards resided at Amsterdam, devoted himself to the construction of the thermometer, and in consequence gained so much notoriety, that he may almost be said to have supplied the north of Europe with the instrument. His own name, too, was so fully associated with the invention, that even to the present day it is given to the scale. Fahrenheit, however, was not destitute of scientific knowledge, nor a mere manufacturer; for to him we are indebted for the discovery of the fact, that the boiling points of liquids are changed by the increase or decrease of atmospheric pressure. This has been proved by observation on the temperature of boiling water on mountains, but may be more easily shown by placing a little water, several degrees below the boiling point, under the receiver of an air-pump, and as the exhaustion proceeds ebullition will be observed, and the water will boil violently. In Fahrenheit's scale the freezing point of water is at 32 degrees, and the boiling at 212 degrees. Reaumur's scale assumes the freezing and boiling points of water as fixed; but the former is registered as 0, and the interval between one and the other is divided into 80 degrees, all temperatures below that of melting ice are therefore minus. The centigrade scale was proposed by Celsius, a Swedish astronomer, and only differs from Reaumur's in having the interval between the freezing and boiling points divided into 100 instead of 80 degrees.

“ Here, however, it will be well to remember, that another standard is necessary to our welfare—a standard of sentiment and character. And where shall this be found? Assuredly not in the opinions and practices of men. The multitude unhappily do evil, and perfection has not been attained by any of the truly good. It is for us, then, to take for our guide the Word of the God of truth. Our appeal should be to the ‘law and the testimony;’ and while it is so, in the humble and devout supplication of the aid of the Holy Spirit, we shall have light in the understanding, peace in the conscience, joy in the heart, and consistency in the life.”

The word “scale” suggests to the ingenious author of this passage the idea of “a standard;” when lo! in the same instant, off he flies at a tangent. His wooden horse stood ready caparisoned—he had got himself into the saddle—there needed but to turn the wooden peg.

Other instances not less preposterous might easily be selected for the reader's amusement or animadversion, according to the mood in which our remarks may find him; but the foregoing are enough for our purpose, and we need not cumber our pages with any more. We dismiss the treatise on “Heat” of the Religious Tract Society with the remark, that we should grieve to see it in the hands of any young person, possessed of a keen sense of the ridiculous, in whose moral and religious welfare we feel interested.

Amongst the series of works for children, published by the Tract Society, to which at an earlier page we have made allusion, is one entitled “The Spirit of Popery, an Exposure of its Origin, Character, and Results, in Letters from a Father to his Children.” This we do not hesitate to pronounce a highly dangerous book; not that we find fault with the Author's mode of treating his subject, still less with his selection of a subject on which to write. The latter, indeed, we consider deserving of all commendation. But we do condemn, and we use no measured terms in our con-

demnation—we do reprobate and abhor the engravings with which the volume is adorned—say rather disgraced. Just let us ask one question—Which is the most vivid way of impressing the imagination, and influencing the minds of children, printing or painting?—speaking to the ear or speaking to the eye? We anticipate but one answer to this inquiry. They who would answer it in any way but that one, know nothing of children—nothing of human nature. We trust, for the sake of his character, that the illustrator of this improper book is to be classed amongst such. We showed this volume to a friend a few days ago. His instant remark was, “Are there Jesuits in the Tract Society?” This may surprise our readers, but their wonder will cease when they read the following list of illustrations, every one of which we can assure them is finished in the most attractive and elaborate style of art. “Sale of Indulgences”—“Submission of Philip IV. of France to the Pope”—“Procession of Palms”—“The Pope”—“The Pope’s Blessing”—“St. Anthony’s Day”—“The Confessional”—“Adoration of the Wafer”—“Homage to the Virgin”—“Prayer for the Dead”—“Mass for the Dead”—“Blessing the Bell.” The following, we think, in these “Tractarian” times, especially seductive—“The Confessional,” and “The Adoration of the Wafer.”

The Religious Tract Society has been a great instrument of good. This is a proposition which we hold to be indisputable; but the Religious Tract Society is a human institution, and as such it is liable to great—aye to fatal—deterioration. It certainly is not, in some important respects, what once it was. But the mischief is, we trust, far from being irreparable. With its members, that is, its subscribers, rests the power, and, let it not be forgotten, the responsibility, of bringing it back to a full and faithful adherence to its own acknowledged principles—principles which carry with them the impress of deep and prayerful consideration on the part of holy men who have gone to their rest, and who, were they now present in the midst of us, would doubtless be amongst the foremost to point out the danger of deviating from them.

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE LAKES, *and other Poems.* By the author of the *Moral of Flowers*, and the *Spirit of the Woods.* London: *Tilt and Bogue.* 1841.

It is related of a distinguished mathematician, who has long since found the path to the Temple of Honour through the labyrinth of the abstract sciences, that he was wont to apply one and the same test to every effort of the Muse from Milton's *Paradise Lost*, or Southey's *Don Roderick*, down to the simplest of fugitive poems in the most watery of annuals or the most ephemeral of magazines; "WHAT DOES IT PROVE?" Now this is certainly a very difficult question to answer, unless we evade it by mystifying the terms, and, availing ourselves of the equivocal, reply, "It proves the author to be a man of pre-eminent genius, or the authoress a woman of fine imagination, and of exquisite taste. Or it proves just the reverse;—that much time has been unprofitably spent, in writing what few persons will read, and what they who *do* will read to no useful purpose." We should be quite prepared, however, to enter into controversy with the demonstration-loving philosopher, and maintain that, though poetry could *prove* nothing, it is capable of teaching much—much, that none can learn without moral improvement, or leave unlearned without moral deterioration. And assuredly, whether it be the great end of human existence to be useful to others, or happy in ourselves, or to combine both in one, to be happy because useful;—this object is quite as likely to be promoted by a volume of poetry like that before us, full of beautiful images, fine taste, and pure moral sentiment, as by a treatise of "Analytical Geometry of Three Dimensions," though it contain "the Theory of Curve Surfaces, and of Curves of double curvature" to boot.

Seriously, however, we think, that in this age of railroads and steam-engines—of novel speculations and of bubble-companies, when the discoveries and deductions of mathematical science are mainly regarded as they create new modes of investment, or originate productive employment of capital, it is more than ever desirable to cultivate a counteracting influence, lest we degenerate indeed into what our great enemy Napoleon, before he became a "throneless homicide," was wont to term as in derision, a nation of shop-keepers. Never, perhaps, since the revival of literature in the reign of Elizabeth, has England been less poetically disposed than at present; and never, assuredly, has the mania of money-making been more prevalent, even among our aristocracy. One half of the Baronage of England, "the most august body in the

world," are probably to be seen in the great advertising media, as connected with the patronage or with the profits of joint-stock companies; a larger portion, it is probable, than literature or art can number among their patrons; and had Mæcenas lived in these times, we should have been likely to meet him in the character of Chairman of the new Vapour Bath Company at Baiæ, or the Association for converting the Via Appia into a railroad; while Virgil might have struck his lyre unheeded to the winds, and Horace scraped his violin unregarded to the *navigators*, being paid, like blind Mæonides, in praise and pence. We fear, however, that with the decline of poetry may be associated the decline of morals; and it probably speaks little better for the virtue, than for the taste of the age, that such poems as the "Recollections of the Lakes" should remain unread, while children of a span long congregate round the book-shops every Friday afternoon to devour "the last Humphrey," and on every drawing-room table, not only within the bills of mortality, but also within the range of fashion, reposes the new "Tale of a Tub." We do not mean to speak disparagingly of either of these works, at the first of which we have seen others laughing, and at the second have laughed ourselves. So small a portion of life, however, can be, or ought to be, spent in the exercise of what has been absurdly termed the "risible faculty," that we should feel and acknowledge our obligation to those who furnish us with nutriment on which higher and worthier appetites may feed—and this has been done, and done well, by the authoress of the "Recollections." We do not know indeed that a single smile will be called up to the countenance of any of her readers, except that a blush may suffuse the cheeks of the "bashful maidens" at the mention of the misletoe, page 163—but they who have an eye for the beauties of nature, or a mind for the developements of intellect, or a heart for the effusions of deep feeling and pious sensibility will find much to interest and attract and delight them in this little volume, without, so far as we have observed, any infusion of those narcotic influences which mingle with the fragrance of the Lily of the Cherwell. (No. I. p. 33.)

We are reminded, by the mention of this work, that we are ourselves, in some degree, chargeable with the neglect of poetry which we deprecate in others;—for with the exception of a little work misnamed ECCLESIA, which exhibits theology more defective than Mr. Faber's in verse not half as musical, and the posthumous publication of Lady Flora Hastings, we have scarcely noticed a single poetical volume since the commencement of our critical labours. Whether this has arisen from the dearth of the material, or from the negligence of the reviewer, is a question which shall be discussed

Had I the dove's swift wings, soon would I quit
 The city's dusky streets and ceaseless din,
 For the calm pleasures it is thine to give.
 I long to hold communion safe as sweet
 With trees and flowers; they are no demagogues,
 They teach no treason, nor with guilty strife
 Seek for advancement through another's fall :
 The flowret that on scarce an inch of earth
 Peeps through the crevice of some mossy wall,
 Is as contented as the giant oak
 That covers half an acre with its shade.—(p. 7.)

Having thus shown that a volume of miscellaneous poetry may produce both sound proof and safe counsel to those who would never dream of looking into it for either, we shall adapt our remaining citations to two classes of readers, who will always, we hope, exist in sufficient numbers to encourage the production and uphold the circulation of works like this—the lovers of piety, and the lovers of poetry—perhaps we should rather say, the lovers of piety who are not insensible to the influence of poetry, and the lovers of poetry, who think that her graces are most attractive, when she is associated in the sisterhood of piety. It would be no easy task to find, in any of our English poets, strains in which such persons would be better pleased to celebrate the most solemn festival of the Christian world than the following :—

“ ‘ The Lord is risen ! ’ Wake, Nature, wake thy lyre—
 Thy lyre of many strings, and spread it far ;
 Trace it, thou Sun, in characters of fire—
 Sing, as at Nature's beck, each morning star ?
 In varying cadence waft it, winds of night,
 When forth ye issue from your cloudy prison ;
 And thou, oh Ocean, with thy voice of might,
 Proclaim to every shore, ‘ The Lord is risen ! ’
 Make it your theme, ye everlasting hills,
 Ye cultured vales which at their foot repose ;
 And you, ye woods, what time the wild gale fills
 With choral symphonies your leafy boughs ;
 Ye, too, that deck the bosom of the earth,
 With emblematic bloom, ye eloquent flowers,
 In balmy whispers speed the tidings forth,
 And make a temple of the meads and bowers.”—(p. 65.)

We have rarely met with finer and more appropriate imagery, more skilfully introduced, and better illustrated by the foil of contrast, than the following portraiture of winter :—

“ Talk not of winter as a dotard old,
 Grey-haired, and feeble ; palsied every limb,
 “ A withered branch his sceptre ; ” 'tis a whim
 He well may laugh to scorn ; a warrior bold,
 Girded with strength is he ! Asleep—awake—
 He is all energy to ear and sight ;
 He bids the winds go forth, and forests quake
 Like flowers before gay summer's fresh'ning gale ;

He doth unchain the floods, and in their might
 Adown the hills they rush, and through the vale,
 With deafning clamour, till they reach the main :—
 The main, how awful in its maddening ire !
 It looks as if 'twould never know again
 The gentleness which summer gales inspire.
 Yet, like most tyrants, winter sometime shews
 A softness foreign to his wonted mood."—(pp. 160, 161.)

There is something very interesting and original in the little poem entitled "The Victor's Trophy," which would not be unworthy of a place among the Remains of Felicia Hemans, of whose manner it forcibly reminds us :—

" Here sleeps a child of song !
 Hush'd is his tuneful lay ;
 Yet on his harp, now broken and unstrung,
 Let the proud wreath which genius loves be flung ;
 Twine ye the classic bay.

" Bring garlands yet again ;
 A warrior here lies low ;
 Then wreath his plumed helm and dinted shield,
 And the good sword he knew so well to wield,
 With the famed laurel bough.

" Another mound !—but who—
 Who fills this nameless grave ?
 One who, through Christ, o'er sin, and hell, and death
 Won threefold victory ! then say what wreath
 Should o'er his ashes wave ?

" Nor laurel twine, nor bay,
 For him who here sleeps calm ;
 Bring ye for him such trophy as is given
 To those who tread the star-paved courts of heaven ;
 Bring palm—symbolic palm !"—(pp. 165, 166.)

We need say nothing more in commendation of this elegant and pleasing volume, for our extracts have been made to little purpose, or the taste of the reader will differ widely from that of the reviewer, if it has not already recommended itself. We had indeed noted two or three inaccuracies—defective rhyme, as,

" Birds to greet thee,
 Carol sweetly ;"

Vulgarity mistaken for simplicity, as when the timid flower is said to be—

———" *afear'd* to try
 The rude and nipping blast ;"

Ungrammatical construction, in the worst stanza of the worst poem in the book, where amidst a quaternion of false rhymes, *won*, *own*, *one*, and *shone*, the authoress apostrophizes thus, the ever-blowing roses :—

" Ye I've overlooked to muse on one ;"

But these are comparatively trifles. On the whole, comparing this volume with that of Mr. Faber, noticed in our first number, we do not hesitate to say, that while the theology of the religious part of the work is as far superior as scripture to tradition, or truth to conjecture, the poetical part is little, if at all, inferior; and if the "Recollections" are not read, as they deserve to be, by the present generation, the authoress may at least solace herself by reflecting, that justice will be rendered to her by generations yet to come. The postponement of a century may detract from the profit; but assuredly it will enhance the praise.

SERMONS. By the late Rev. THOMAS WEBSTER, B.D., Rector of St. Botolph's, Cambridge, and Vicar of Oakington. London: Seeleys. 1840.

THIS posthumous volume winds up the labours of an eminent servant of Christ, lately gone to his rest and his reward. It is his funeral crown, and a goodly one. For nearly forty years, and in a variety of ministerial engagements, Mr. Webster had approved himself to the Church, and, we doubt not, to its Divine Master. It would be no easy task to single out a man, in whom was a richer combination of those faculties and attainments, the right direction of which constitutes the individual a blessing to his age and generation. A sound, perspicuous understanding; theological knowledge acquired in a good school, and so easily and so well acquired as to be incorporated with his mind; a temper that nothing could ruffle; deep personal piety; a natural talent for business; indefatigable industry; and complete devotion to his sacred employments:—these, we venture to assert, not doubting but that all who knew him will bear witness to the justice of our report,—were the characteristics of this excellent clergyman. The *acknowledged* productions of his pen were not numerous. Engaged many years in tuition, then secretary of the Hibernian Society, and Editor of the *Christian Guardian*, while all along sedulously fulfilling the duties of a parish priest,—it is marvellous that he should have found leisure for any performances out of these tracks. From time to time, however, he gave to the public volumes, of no great pretension indeed, but of real utility. His selection of Hymns has obtained a very extensive circulation: his Family Prayer-Book is of sterling merit: and a little work entitled "The Sacramental Week," is, in our judgment, the best

for its object that has appeared. That object is to furnish a manual of sound instruction, and devotional exercises, for the young,—especially for those who have not enjoyed considerable advantages of education. It is a very cheap publication, and we sincerely believe that, from its wide diffusion among such as are just confirmed, and indeed in family circles generally, much religious fruit might be expected.

We are not, however, writing the biography of the Author; in commending his latest work to the notice of the public, we could not withhold our feeble tribute to his general merits. A brief memoir of his latter days, composed, we believe, by one of his family, and stamped with judgment and feeling, will gratify the Christian reader, by showing with how peaceful an end Mr. Webster's pious labours terminated; and his example will probably go some way, by God's blessing, to quicken the path of languid piety.

There are many considerations to justify a minister, or his friends, in sending forth a volume of his sermons, notwithstanding the number already abroad, of which a majority, no doubt, sleep undisturbed on the bookseller's self, and although it may confessedly fall short of many extant sermons in attractiveness and theological merit. Allowing it to be a work of ordinary excellence, the divinity scriptural, the statements and appeals fairly instructive and impressive, we are of opinion that in many cases its publication, especially after the Author's decease, may be vindicated and approved. For what is the object of such publications, we mean the legitimate object? Not to win celebrity to the Author—not to gratify learned minds and fastidious tastes—but to make the ignorant wise unto salvation, to awaken thoughtless sinners, and to edify the militant Christian. Now, the death of a zealous clergyman can hardly fail to produce a considerable sensation in the place which has enjoyed, perhaps for a series of years, the benefit of his pious and affectionate labours. Many, who had long sat under his public ministrations unmoved, and turned a deaf ear to his private exhortations, or at any rate not allowed them a durable influence on their practices, are softened and troubled in conscience, after the pastor they could not but sorrow is taken from them. Oh, if they could again hear that pleading voice, which had been poured out upon them so long in vain, and is now for ever hushed, they are persuaded that its words and accents would go with power to their hearts! And to some extent, perhaps, the expectation might be verified. The voice from the sepulchre would sound more eloquent and awful than the voice from the pulpit. And though the deceased pastor

shall not rise from the dead to repeat the message he used to deliver, yet may that message be repeated to his flock in the very words which he had employed in his addresses to them, and with the additional solemnity, the peculiar unction, which the grave and eternity confer.

But not only, nor principally, to such as have resisted the living pastor's labours of love may his printed sermons be instruments of spiritual good, when he lies silent in the grave. Those who had experienced the power and comfort of his ministrations and made a certain progress in the kingdom of heaven, will probably derive no small advantage from having such a monitor, such a remembrancer, such a comforter bequeathed to them ;—*luci repercussâ reficit*. On perusing again the expositions and appeals which they had listened to not without seriousness and emotion, when poured upon them from his ardent lips, they will now experience a deeper solicitude on the subjects treated, and feel how much they will have to answer for, should such discourses fail to render them Christians of no common stamp. The fears and hopes and holy resolutions, first awakened in their bosoms by one of these sermons when delivered in the Church, will revive with augmented force. That which had been superficially traced by the preaching will be profoundly graven by the reading of it, for it will find the heart softened into keener sensibility by the sadness of bereavement. The dead bones of Elisha shall work greater miracles than his living hand, and the memory of the sainted pastor shall complete the work that had been left imperfect by his actual ministry.

These and many other considerations will more than excuse, in our humble judgment, the publication of sermons, during the lifetime, but especially after the decease, of the author, though confessedly not of superior merit. They may do more good than better ones to the sheep that were accustomed to that pasture ; but the volume before us calls for no such apology. It is a work of intrinsic value, such as the learned may read with satisfaction, and the unlearned with understanding and advantage. The divinity of it is of a good stamp, from the mint of our great reformers ; and we are persuaded that a young clergyman, who forms himself on the model of such a preacher, will prove "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." When we open this book, we find ourselves in a thoroughly evangelical atmosphere, and feel the spirit of our liturgy and homilies breathing upon us.

The new school of divines of whose temple tradition is an equal and coordinate pillar with inspired scripture, would not relish an erudition so truly protestant. Nor will these discourses make their way with that large class of readers or hearers, whose first

inquiry is whether or not the preacher is interesting, and who take little interest except in what startles by novelty of statement, or gorgeousness of colouring; but those of our readers whose delight it is to feed upon genuine scriptural theology, set forth with great good sense and perspicuity, and who, not content with being well instructed, desire to have their hearts improved by a close application of religious truth to the consumer, and to be provided with sound rules of conduct deduced from no ordinary acquaintance with the world and the human heart, will thank us for recommending this volume. Such sermons as those on "the Blessed effects of Conversion," "The Backslider in heart," "Assurance," "The Easy Yoke," will exhibit the character of Mr. Webster's pulpit ministry, and fully bear out our eulogy.

But let us not be misunderstood, as if we meant to intimate that, in disdaining the meretricious arts so much employed now-a-days to catch itching ears, or in giving us solid meat and sterling coin, Mr. Webster has laid himself open to the charge of being heavy. The composition, if generally plain and unadorned, without any singular graces of style, is nervous and pointed; and there are passages now and then which rise unaffectedly to a lofty grandeur; and many, as in the sermon on "the World passing away," of a deeply pathetic cast, though sense, sobriety, truth, and usefulness are never sacrificed to gratify the imagination.

Mr. Webster was a true Churchman, dutifully, zealously, affectionately attached to the ecclesiastical establishment of these realms, born under its wing, and doubly pledged to it by becoming one of its presbyters; he had also deeply pondered its claims to his regard, and was satisfied of their validity. But he was also a *wise* adherent, one who did not weaken the cause he set himself to uphold, by erroneous and exaggerated views of the position and authority of the Church. This term, Church, it is well-known, has various significations; and the want of a precise definition, has led to fairer contention, and has lengthened, and darkened, and embittered controversy to a lamentable extent. Let us take it to signify that system of combined agencies, which obtained substantially in primitive times, such as,—episcopal and pastoral superintendence; the ministry of God's word by regularly ordained functionaries; the sacraments; the creeds and formularies drawn up and attested by its leading ministers, with an authentic scheme of public worship and discipline; and we shall have an organ of many parts, but "fully joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth," the very organ which Jesus Christ has framed, in his wisdom and goodness, for the formation of a people to serve him on earth and in heaven.

The Church is denominated "the pillar and ground of the truth." Observe, it is the column and base that support the whole fabric of evangelical verities, enumerated by St. Paul in 1 Tim. iii. 16. beginning with the manifestation of a divine Redeemer in the flesh, and concluding with his being "received up into glory." To the Church is assigned the momentous duty of upholding this glorious system. It is the noble pillar, resting upon its solid pedestal, which preserves the majestic edifice of "the truth," that is to say, of Christian orthodoxy, from falling down and becoming a ruinous heap. But let not the pillar be confounded with the foundation, upon which itself, with all other parts of the edifice, ultimately rests. That foundation is the Apostles and Prophets, or in other words, the inspired testimony which they have left behind in the books of the Old and New Testaments, and eminently the doctrines and precepts which fell from the mouth of the Holy One himself, and are recorded in that precious volume—**THE BIBLE.**

Taking this view,—and we entertain great confidence of its soundness,—of the nature, position, and office of the Church, we must believe that to set it up as a sort of colleague with the Divine Scriptures, is, to say the least, an erroneous and a dangerous representation. They are not, we conceive, correctly exhibited as joint and coequal authorities. The Church is that vital form of moral organization, whereby evangelical truth, which is "the power of God unto salvation," is dispensed, explained, and enforced. Her outline is traced in the inspired record, and hence her sacred claim to reverence and dutiful love. She is the teacher, and the Bible is the text-book : she the channel, and God's word the fountain. When she speaks it must not be of herself, as though she was an inspired prophetess, or possessed of truth supplementary to that in the divine volume ; but as a steward of those living oracles, which contain all the truths that are necessary to salvation. Matters of order and discipline—these having nothing in them "contrary to God's word written,"—she is empowered to ordain ; and great is the veneration due to her judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, when that judgment is distinctly recorded, and duly ascertained. But articles of faith she may not impose, other than are explicitly or implicitly propounded in the book of inspiration.

It is a point of no slight moment to the interests of pure and undefiled religion, that men who, like our Author, fill a space in the public eye for a series of years, should maintain in undeviating attachment to the great principles of the Reformers. None was more firmly attached to those doctrines, which were esteemed by such worthies as Archbishop Leighton, Bishop Hopkins, Hall, and

Beveridge, Mr. Walker of Truro, Mr. Scott, Mr. Cecil, the Venns, Mr. Wilberforce, and others of that school of divinity, as fundamental articles of the gospel; nor was any one more satisfied that their exposition of those doctrines was in substantial accordance throughout with the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies of the Anglican Church. He clave to the system, not blindly, not mechanically, but intelligently and with all his soul. Knowing the "ancient paths," and not liable to mistake *old by-ways* for *highways*, he walked in those apostolic paths, undoubting and rejoicing. It is of vast consequence, we repeat it, to the welfare of the Church, and to the comfort and stability of less mature and less enlightened Christians, to find themselves under the shadow of clergymen distinguished for learning, and judgment, and piety, when adhering to the religious sentiments they were early taught to revere as orthodox, in a day in which the banners of a dozen novelties are floating in various quarters, and one is calling to us, "lo, here," and another, "lo, there." And certainly the excellent Author of these sermons holds no mean place among the watchmen of our Zion, who will be honoured in future ages for maintaining the ancient landmarks. We regard him as one of those stout-hearted champions who stand out, like mighty moles, to protect the coasts of divine truth, and to stem those dashing billows of tridentine dogmatism, which threaten to sweep away the hallowed structure, reared anew by the hands, and cemented with the blood, of our Protestant martyrs. May God in his mercy multiply to his Church, the number of spiritual warriors, like-minded with Mr. Webster!

There is such an equality of merit in the discourses before us, that we might open the volume at random, and transcribe any leaf, without fear of discrediting our report, or disappointing the reader, for their value does not arise from a number of *purpurei panni*, by which the general homeliness of the composition is relieved. It is nowhere ambitious, it is everywhere edifying. Our space permits but a single extract, which we take from Sermon IV. on Deut. xxxii. 31, entitled, "The Believer's Rock." It is a fair, and by no means particularly favourable, specimen of the serious and searching style that ran through Mr. Webster's preaching:—

"The rock then of many nominal Christians is not as our rock, even in their own judgment, as to the *foundation of their hopes*.

"Of how many must it be said, 'they are without hope, and without God in the world;' not that they are without some general and vague idea of future happiness,—but it is utterly undefined; it rests on no solid ground; they can give no reason of 'the hope that is in them;' it vanishes when most they stand in need of it; and to such a degree is this carried, that they even shrink from contemplating the period when alone their hopes can be

realized—nay often when in sick and dying circumstances, they close their ears to every intimation of their approaching end.

“Taking indeed, the world at large, there is a latent consciousness that all is not right;—a kind of conviction, such as actuates a man on the eve of bankruptcy. That account, he is ready to say, ‘must not be enquired into; that stock must not be taken.—I hope some favourable change may take place in my affairs, but I do not like to think of the matter.’ This is the practical confession of multitudes, and is the real root of much of the dissipation in which many indulge, and of the neglect and profanation of this sacred day. The public worship of God; the faithful preaching of the gospel; the solemn declarations of an approaching judgment, have a disturbing effect; men oftentimes shrink from these unpleasant truths; they interrupt their peace. ‘We will attend to them by and by, but not yet, our case is not perhaps exactly what it ought to be, but we have not now time for inquiry.’

“Whereas the true Christian earnestly seeks acquaintance with his own character; he desires to know the very worst of his case, to ascertain his exact situation. He fears lest by any means he should deceive himself, and instead of putting away every unpleasant apprehension, and stifling every rising doubt: he is continually bringing himself to the touchstone, examining his heart and life, and praying with the Psalmist ‘Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.’ He dreads the idea of building with untempered mortar, and therefore he diligently attends at the house of God, and reverently listens to plain, and faithful, and serious sermons, and endeavours to correct what is wrong either in principle or practice. The hope thus founded on careful and frequent examination, must even in the judgment of an enemy, be very far superior to that which rests on presumptuous ignorance.”

SHORT NOTICE.

PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS. By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH.
London: *Seeley and Burnside*. 1841.

WE have experienced too much pleasure in the perusal of this book to wish that it had not been written. We *do* wish, however, that there had not been the motive for writing it, which the gifted authoress has assigned. She dreads, and very naturally, those literary resurrection-men, who pounce upon the memory of a public character like eagles hastening to the prey; and before the grave, it may be, has closed over the relics of its recent victim, advertise with indecent precipitation, “A Memoir of C. E., with full particulars of her private history, and original correspondence, from authentic sources.” “Writers,” she says, “who are themselves wholly unenlightened by spiritual knowledge, and uninfluenced by spiritual feeling, will take up as a good speculation what must be to them a mystery, and wrong the subject of their

memorial, while they injure the cause for which (she) laboured. Even among those of better understanding in the ways of truth, we do not often meet sound judgment, calm discretion, and refined delicacy, combined with affection for the departed, and zeal for the gospel. Private journals are sought out, confidential letters raked together, and a most unseemly exposure made, alike of the dead and of the living.—(p. 2.)

To obviate this, accordingly, the "Personal Recollections" have been published. The authoress, like *Richie Moniplies*, will prevent others from "setting down aught of her in malice," by saying the worst that can be said of herself. *How* she has said this, may be inferred by those who are conversant (and who is not?) with any of her multifarious works, all of which possess, in a greater or less degree, the charm of being the transcript of a powerful and original mind—talents always "zealously affected," if not always discreetly applied, in the cause of philanthropy, of piety, and of truth. Whatever we may think of her views on particular subjects, we read her works with greater interest, even when we differ, than those of many others, with whom it is our fortune to agree; and without pledging our assent to every sentiment expressed in the "Personal Recollections," we are fully persuaded that few, if any, will begin the book, who do not also make an end. There is one text, which all will admit to be strikingly exemplified in *Charlotte Elizabeth*, that "whatever she does, she does it heartily, as to the Lord and not unto man;" and in reading her "Recollections" we were reminded of an observation which we have heard, that if "zeal without discretion may have done some mischief, discretion without zeal has never done any good." Had these high qualities been equipoised in *Charlotte Elizabeth*, her name would have been scarcely, if at all, inferior to that of *Hannah More*; and, after all, when we consider the chief end of writing, we are by no means sure that the one has not done as much execution with her "wild notes," as the other with her "set music." After this it is needless to commend the work. Those who are acquainted with the other productions of the authoress will read it on *their* account; those who are not, on its own—and by none will the time have been unprofitably spent, if the example of the writer shall persuade them, at least as to the principle of their conduct, to "go and do likewise."

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

AUGUST, 1841.

CHRISTIAN LIFE, ITS COURSE, ITS HINDRANCES, AND ITS HELPS: *Sermons, preached mostly in the Chapel of Rugby School.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., Head Master of Rugby School, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London: *B. Fellowes.* 1841.

"THERE is at this moment," said Mr. Newman, in his letter to Dr. Jelf in explanation of No. 90; "a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century. The age is moving towards something, and most unhappily the one religious communion among us which has of late years been practically in possession of this something is the Church of Rome. She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may especially be called Catholic."

Assuming that these words represent the sentiment of those, who according to Dr. Pusey, "have been God's chief instruments in the great work of restoring half-forgotten doctrine, our friend himself" (Newman), "the author of the Christian Year," (Keble) and Dr. Pusey who thus adopts them for his own, it is obvious that several questions of no common interest and importance are necessary to the full understanding of what is meant. In what sense was the last century "satisfied," and what is the "something" which satisfied it? And what is that "something yet

more deep and true" towards which the religious mind of our Church is now on the advance ?

These questions may be answered in a great degree from the excellent work of Dr. Arnold, the title of which heads our article—or rather from the admirable Introduction, which, in the present state of this unhappy controversy, is a document above all price. It may not indeed prevent the impending schism ; for by the extreme advocates of the Oxford system this volume would be accounted little better than a *liber hereticus prohibitus*, even though the title-page exhibits the author's designation, "late Fellow of Oriel ;"—but it may, and we trust will, operate as a timely warning to some, who might otherwise be "spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit ; after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."

In what sense then, we may first enquire, can the last century be said to have been "satisfied," and which is the "something" which satisfied it ? "The period," replies Dr. Arnold, "which Mr. Newman and his friends so disliked, had in its religious character been distinguished by its professions of extreme veneration for the scripture : in its quarrel with the system of the preceding period it had rested all its cause on the authority of the scripture ; it had condemned the older system because scripture could give no warrant for it."—(p. viii.) If this be correct—and it is quite as much entitled to credit by the authority on which it rests as the counterstatement of the Oxford triumvirate—then we must conclude, that the last century was satisfied with scripture, in the relation of a supreme and unappealable arbiter concerning all doctrines to be believed, and all duties to be performed ; that a text for confirmation (the application being admitted) was regarded by it as an end of all strife ; and that holy writ, being the sole and direct authority for all the truths of the Christian religion, was recognized as embodying certain main principles as to the constitution and rules of the Christian Church, which were to be applied according to the varying circumstances of mankind. The questions agitated by the last century therefore concern indeed the application of these principles, but do not affect the principles themselves, which, like their divine Author are "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

We do not suppose indeed that Dr. Pusey will assent to this, or to any conceivable interpretation of his words which can be based upon the ordinary significance of terms and phrases. It is one among the many strange dogmas of his party, that "the age is all light, and that therefore the Church is bound to be deep, impenetrable, occult in her views and character. We are assailed by

science," they say; "we must protect ourselves by mystery. Mystery fits in with the age exactly. It is just what the age wants." So deep, accordingly, is this cloud of mystery, that even the acute vision of Dr. Arnold is unable to penetrate it. The production upon which we are now commenting has been noticed by Dr. Pusey in his latest publication,* and designated with the characteristic superciliousness of his school, "a preface written to controvert what the author supposes to be the peculiar views of Mr. Newman and his friends." By implication, therefore, the author is wrong in his supposition, and forms an erring estimate of these "peculiar" views. We do not apprehend, however, that either the usefulness or the accuracy of Dr. Arnold's work is likely to be diminished on this account, for whatever mysteries may be reserved for the initiated, the head master of Rugby School has the same access as others to their *exoteric* teaching, and his preface applies to such of their views as are defined. For the rest, "no man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him." Dr. Arnold professes, and we fully believe him, "that he has not knowingly remained in ignorance of any argument which may have been used in defence of Mr. Newman's system; I have always desired," he affirms, "to know what he and his friends say, and on what grounds they say it." Yet such, it appears, is the obscurity of these more than pythonic oracles, that the response has been studied, even by a late fellow of Oriel, in vain, and his desire to understand it is ungratified still. But Dr. Arnold, as we shall hereafter see, has several associates in his ignorance, whose theological and intellectual standard will leave him but little reason to be ashamed of it.

We shall, accordingly, be content to state in his words, for we know of none more accurate, nor can we devise any more explicit, the answer to our second inquiry—"What is that something yet more deep and true, towards which the religious mind of our Church is now on the advance?"

"Beset by their horror of the nineteenth century, they (the Tractarians) sought for something most opposite to it, and therefore they turned to what they called Christian antiquity. Had they judged of their own times fairly—had they appreciated the good of the nineteenth century, as well as its evil, they would have looked for their remedy not to the second or third or fourth centuries, but to the first; they would have tried to restore, not the Church of Cyprian, or Athanasius, or Augustine, but the Church of St. Paul and of St. John. Now, this it is most certain that they have not done. Their appeal is not then to Scripture, but to the opinions and practices of the dominant party in the ancient Church. They have endeavoured to set those opinions and practices, under the name of apostolical tradition, on a level with the authority of the Scriptures."—(p. xxi.)

* Apology for No. 90, p. 131.

It is almost superfluous to cite in this place the language of our Sixth Article, which declares that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." To this Article, however, what Dr. Pusey calls an "ultra-Protestant sense" is given, except it be combined with the twentieth*, which determines, (according to him) "who is so to prove it; who has the power of requiring what can be so proved to be believed"—a power which is declared to be vested in the Church—"the Church has authority in controversies of faith." While quoting, however, with implicit assent and unqualified approbation *this* part of the Article, Dr. Pusey does not think it necessary to add how that authority is expressly limited and defined. Clearly, then, a judgment of contrariety exists somewhere, extrinsic and independent of the Church; and where can this be, but in the mind and conscience of the individual? The difference, accordingly,—and a most important one it is,—between the Article and those Expositors who constitute, in respect of it, that object of their own utter contempt and abhorrence, a "modern school;"—amounts to this: that while the Article combines both the authority and the limitation, they, in their nervous and sensitive terror of ultra-Protestantism, reject the second while they affirm the first. "Not a word is said in favour of Scripture having no rule or method to fix interpretation by, or, as is commonly expressed, being the sole rule of faith;" on which comment of Mr. Newman Dr. Pusey observes, "that so far from drawing the article to any extreme view, our friend only shows it does not contain anything contradicting the authority of the Church and tradition."† No; but though the article does not contradict, it defines, by implication at least, the extent and the exercise of the authority in either case. It implies, that the Church is fallible—it excludes what Dr. Arnold terms "one of the most unaccountable phenomena of the human mind" (however frequent its occurrence among disciples of this school)—"the conclusion, that the Scriptures and the early Church are of equal authority, and that the authority of both is truly divine—which would virtually be, to deny the inspiration of either. For two things so different in several points as the Christianity of the Scriptures and that of the early Church may conceivably be both false, but it is hard to think they can both be perfectly true." That the one is perfectly true, Article vi. affirms; but with respect to the other, does not Article xx. imply that the contrary of its truth must at least be possible?

* Pusey's Apology for No. 90, p. 13.

† Ibid. p. 14.

In stating this dilemma, however,

"I am allowing," continues Dr. Arnold, "what is by no means true, without many qualifications, that Mr. Newman's system is that of the early Church. The historical inquiry as to the doctrines of the early Church would lead me into far too wide a field. I may only notice, in passing, how many points require to be carefully defined in conducting such an inquiry—as for instance, what we mean by the term 'early Church' as to time; for that may be fully true of the Church in the fourth century, which is only partially true of it in the third, and only in a very slight degree true of it in the second or the first. And again, what do we mean by the term 'early Church' as to persons; for a few eminent writers are not even the whole clergy, neither is it by any means to be taken on their authority that their views were really those of all the Bishops and Presbyters of the Christian world; but if they were, the clergy are not the Church, nor can their judgments be morally considered as the voice of the Church, even if we were to admit that they could, at any time, constitute its voice legally. But for my present purpose we may take for granted, that Mr. Newman's system as to the pre-eminence of the sacraments, and the necessity of apostolical succession to give them their efficacy, was the doctrine of the early Church—then I say that this system is so different from that of the New Testament, that to invest the two with equal authority is not to make the Church system divine, but to make the scriptural system human. Assuredly the thirst for something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century will not be allayed by a draught so scanty and so vapid; but after the mirage has beguiled and disappointed him for a season, the traveller presses on the more eagerly towards the true and living well."—(pp. xxxix.—xlii.)

It is but reasonable, however, that the "something" of these leaders of "the movement now making in defence of the Church and her principles"* (for so Mr. Sewell describes them, even when he seems to differ) should be stated in their own words; and, accordingly, Dr. Arnold has quoted at some length from a document, which they are themselves willing to admit as embodying the main principles of their system, Mr. Perceval's well-known Letter to the Editor of the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, reprinted in the Oxford Herald of January 30, 1841. It appears from this, that the great remedy for the evils of the times, "the something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century," or at least the most effectual means of attaining to it, is declared to be the maintenance of the doctrine of apostolical succession. "The sacraments, and not preaching, are the sources of divine grace." "The only way of salvation is the partaking of the body and blood of our sacrificed Redeemer; the mean expressly authorized by him for that purpose is the holy sacrament of his supper; the security by him no less expressly authorized for the continual and due application of that sacrament, is the apostolical commission of the Bishops and under them the Presbyters of the Church." "The power of making the body and blood of Christ is vested in the successors of the Apostles." And in the most recent manifesto (Dr. Pusey's

* Sewell's Letter to Pusey, p. 14.

Defence of No. 90) it is not only stated that the two great sacraments are "justifying rites, or instruments of communicating the atonement," but the Author, as dexterous in the use of brackets as his friend Mr. Newman, has contrived, with an astounding effrontery, to make our earliest form of scriptural instruction affirm, that they are the **EXCLUSIVE** instruments of justification. "With this coincides the definition of our Catechism, that there are two sacraments only generally [i.e. universally] necessary to salvation."—(p. 34.) Hence it will appear, that Dr. Arnold has understated the case when he says, "These two doctrines are the foundation of the whole system. God's grace and our salvation come to us *principally* through the virtue of the sacraments (he might have said **EXCLUSIVELY**, if Dr. Pusey's interpretation of the Catechism is to be received as genuine): the virtue of the sacraments depends upon the apostolical succession of those who administer them." The consequences which follow, from the words of Dr. Arnold, thus strengthened, shall be stated by himself:—

"The clergy, therefore, thus holding in their hands the most precious gifts of the Church, acquire naturally the title of the Church itself. The Church, as possessed of so mysterious a virtue as to communicate to the only means of salvation their saving efficacy, becomes at once an object of the deepest reverence. What wonder if to a body endowed with so transcendent a gift there should be given also the spirit of wisdom to discern all truth; so that the solemn voice of the Church in its creeds, and in the decrees of its General Councils, must be received as the voice of God himself? Being members of a body so exalted, and receiving our very salvation in a way altogether above reason, we must be cautious how we either trust to our individual conscience rather than to the command of the Church, or how we venture to exercise our reason in judging of what the Church teaches? Childlike faith and childlike obedience are the dispositions which God most loves. What, then, are they who are not of the Church—who do not receive the sacraments from those who can alone give them their virtue? Surely they are aliens from God—they cannot claim his covenanted mercies; and the goodness which may be apparent in them may not be a real goodness: God may see that it is false, though to us it appear sincere; but it is certain that they do not possess the only appointed means of salvation; and therefore we must consider their state as dangerous, although we may not venture openly to condemn them."—p. xvii.)

"But," Dr. Arnold continues, "the system which they hold up as better and deeper than satisfied the last century, is a remedy which has been tried once already, and its failure was so palpable, that all the evil of the eighteenth century was but the reaction from that enormous evil, which this remedy, if it be one, had at any rate been powerless to cure. Apostolical succession, the dignity of the clergy, the authority of the Church, were triumphantly maintained through several centuries; and their full development was coincident, to say the least, with the corruption alike of Christ's religion and of Christ's Church. So far were they from tending to realize the promises of prophecy, to perfect Christ's body up to the measure of the stature of Christ's own fulness, that Christ's Church declined during their ascendancy more and more;—she fell alike from truth and from holiness; and their doctrines, if they did not cause the evil, were at least quite unable to restrain it. For on whatever points the fifteenth century differed from the

fourth, it cannot be said that it upheld the apostolical succession less peremptorily, or attached a less value to Church tradition and Church authority. I am greatly understating the case, but I am content for the present to do so. I will not say that Mr. Newman's favourite doctrines were the very Antichrist which corrupted Christianity: I will only say that they did not prevent its corruption; but, when they were most exalted, Christian truth and Christian goodness were most depressed."—(p. xxix.)

Still, however, it might be rejoined, admitting all this, it does not follow as a necessary consequence, that what has failed once cannot be successful on a second trial; or that the original failure might not be designed as a trial of faith and an exercise of patient obedience. Undoubtedly so; we answer; but the only "note" which could warrant the repetition of the experiment would be the expression of a divine purpose in respect of it, which would make things impossible with man possible with God.

"We ask, therefore, of Mr. Newman and his friends, to bring some warrant of Scripture for that which they declare to be God's will. They speak very positively, and say, that 'the security by our Lord, no less expressly authorized for the continuance and due application of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is the apostolical commission of the Bishops, and under them the Presbyters of the Church.' They say that our Lord has 'authorized this no less expressly than He has authorized the holy supper as the mean of partaking his blessed body and blood.' What our Lord has said concerning the communion is not truly represented. He instituted it as one mean of grace among many, not as *the* mean; neither the sole mean, but the principal. But allow, for an instant, that it was instituted as *the* mean, and give this sense to those well-known and ever-memorable words in which our Lord commanded his disciples to eat the bread and drink the cup in remembrance of Him. His words commanding us to do this are express; 'not less express,' we are told, 'is his sanction of the apostolical commission of the Bishops, as the security for the continuance and due application of the sacrament.' Surely these writers allow themselves to pervert language so habitually, that they do not consider when, and with regard to whom, they are doing it. They say that our Lord has sanctioned the necessity of apostolical succession, in order to secure the continuance and efficacy of the sacrament, 'no less expressly' than he instituted the sacrament itself. If they had merely asserted that He had sanctioned the necessity of apostolical succession, we might have supposed, that by some interpretation of their own they implied his sanction of it, from words which to other men bore no such meaning. But in saying that he has 'expressly sanctioned it,' they have, most unconsciously I trust, ascribed their own words to our Lord; they make him to say what He has not said, unless they can produce some other credible record of his words besides the books of the four Evangelists and the apostolical Epistles."—(pp. xxxii., xxxiii.)

On the whole, then, Dr. Arnold's great objection to Mr. Newman's system is, "that it destroys Christ's Church, and sets up an evil in its stead." Christ's Church is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. The fabric which Mr. Newman and his friends have made so specious and imposing is based upon the artificial substratum of the thing which they are pleased to call Catholicity, and cemented with the untempered mortar of human tradition.

“Catholicity,” they say, “is the only test of truth. With respect to the supreme authority of inspired Scripture, it stands thus: Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth; Scripture proves it. Scripture is the document of faith; tradition the witness of it. The true creed is the Catholic interpretation of Scripture, or scripturally-proved tradition. Scripture and tradition, taken together, are the joint rule of faith.”* “To impugn tradition is blasphemy.” To this, indeed, there would seem to be one very simple answer—Who knows what and where is tradition—who does *not* know what and where is Scripture? If tradition be the “rule of faith,” it is a rule of which not only the whole body of the laity, but by far the larger proportion of the clergy, are profoundly ignorant; and even of those disciples of the Oxford school who have imbibed from their doctors this anti-Protestant, or we might rather say anti-Christian, dogma, and of the doctors themselves—the “apostolicals and sub-apostolicals,” according to Mr. Froude’s new nomenclature—we doubt whether any two would agree as to the traditions which constitute this “joint rule.” Both, we suspect, would take refuge in the vague and general expressions of the hackneyed canon of Vincentius Lirinensis, which have been quoted *usque ad nauseam*, and which we find repeated for the thousand and first time in Dr. Pusey’s last Apology (p. 6). Having affirmed, what no one will deny, that “what in times near to the Apostles was universally received by the Church, is more likely to be apostolic than any system formed now,” he adds, “For myself, you are aware, I hold much more than this, and with the consent of our great divines believe that what in early ages can be proved, according to the rule of Vincentius, to have been held everywhere, at all times, and by all, is, if matter of doctrine, binding still.” To this Dr. Arnold replies, that “the system which *he* recommends has the better claim to all the authority which can be derived from Christian antiquity, being the system not of the second or third or fourth centuries, but that of the first, i.e. of the Apostles themselves; while Dr. Whately (for in this ill-omened controversy the tug of war is when Greek meets Greek, and the champions of scriptural supremacy, as well as the abettors of traditional usurpation, are from Oriel) has proved the nullity of the canon itself, “inasmuch as it does not, with all its apparent precision, determine whether the abode of the inspired authority is this or that particular Church, or the Universal Church; and whether the Universal Church is to be regarded as the *numerical* majority; or the majority of those who

* Appendix to Keble’s Sermon on Primitive Tradition.

lived within a certain (arbitrarily fixed) period; or a majority of the sound and orthodox believers, i.e. of those in agreement with the persons who so designate them." * "There is no one, I suppose," observes the Archbishop, "who would limit within these words the articles of his creed, rejecting everything that had ever been denied by any;" and, consequently, the rule is insufficient, being obviously capable of excluding truth, if not of admitting error. It cannot be affirmed of *this*, as of Holy Scripture, "that it containeth all things necessary to salvation;" nor can it be held, at least by a member or minister of the Church of England, that it containeth anything, not contained in Scripture, which is to be believed as an article of the faith, or thought requisite and necessary to salvation. At all events, it is the solemn obligation of our priesthood, "out of the Scripture to instruct the people committed to their charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture." † "What you are to teach," observes Archbishop Whately, "is not what others are convinced, but what you are yourselves convinced, is declared or implied in Scripture. Were you to inculcate what you were not yourselves thus convinced of, though it might chance to be in fact scriptural, you yourselves, having received it on human authority, would have been setting up man in the place of God. And to repudiate this procedure is the grand fundamental principle of PROTESTANTISM." ‡

Fortunately for us, this word is used by an Archbishop, or we know not what castigation might be inflicted on us for the very mention of that odious Protestantism, which, according to a disciple of this school, who will not long, we suppose, be left uncanonized, § "sticks in people's gizzards." Nothing can exceed the supercilious air with which Dr. Pusey and his coadjutors speak of Protestant theologians as "a modern school;" nor the rancour with which they vituperate whatever they are pleased to call "ultra-Protestant." Indeed, they scruple not broadly to state, in what has now become their accredited quarterly organ, that "Anglicans are almost unchurched by the protestantism which has mixed itself up with their ecclesiastical proceedings, as Romanists are almost unchurched by their superstitions;" and that they, being "Catholic minds, would be unable to see their way, if our own communion were to own itself Protestant, while foreign communions declined the superstitions, of which they are too tole-

* Essay iii. Danger of an erroneous Imitation of Christ's Teaching.

† Ordination Service.

‡ Whately, Discourse i., on the best Mode of conveying Scripture Instruction.

§ We should recommend, for St. Froude's Day, the 1st of April.

rant"—and they can say nothing more respectful of the Church of England, than that "they do not think St. Austin's teaching can be taken as a direction to them to quit their Church on account of its incidental Protestantism, unsatisfactory as such a note is." * Considering that St. Austin wrote only *three* centuries after the Apostles, we should think that the Apostles Paul, Peter, and John would be better and safer counsellors than the Bishop of Hippo. Waiving this, however, for the present, we return to Dr. Arnold, who asks emphatically,—

"What does the true and perfect Church want, that she should borrow from the broken cisterns of idolatry? What has she not, that Christ's bride should have? What has she not, that Mr. Newman's system can give her? But, because she loves her Lord, and stands fast in His faith, and has been enlightened by his truth, she will endure no other mediator than Christ, she will repose her trust only on His word, she will worship in the light, and will abhor the words, no less than the works, of darkness. Her sisters, the elder Churches, she loves and respects even as she would be herself loved and respected; but she will not, and may not, worship them, nor even, for their sakes, believe error to be truth, or foolishness to be wisdom. She would not impose her yoke upon future generations, nor will she submit her own neck to the yoke of antiquity. She dreads especially that sin of which her Lord has so emphatically warned her—the sin against the Holy Ghost. She will neither lie against Him, by declaring that He is where his fruits are not manifested; nor blaspheme Him, by saying that He is not where his fruits are. Rites and ordinances may be vain; prophets may be false; miracles may be miracles of Satan; but the signs of the Holy Spirit, truth and holiness, can never be ineffectual, can never deceive, can never be evil; where they are, and only where they are, there is God."—(p. lx.)

Now this is a practical test, plainly and forcibly applied, and fully justified, it would appear, by the words of One who never spake in vain. "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him." With ordinary men it would appear decisive, and they would not believe it the less, because it was stated in language perfectly intelligible and universally applicable. But by thus dealing with the controversy as a practical question, Dr. Arnold has incurred, whether consciously or not, the most vehement vituperation of one, who is not, in the full sense, if we may believe himself, even an "apostolical"—who, at all events, "experienced the most serious pain at the publication of No. 90." In that strange compilation entitled *Christian Morals*, where the ingenious author has occupied himself in attempting to sew the symbolic teaching of the gospel, like a piece of new cloth, upon the old garment worn by Aristotle and others of the metaphysical school, the professor pronounces, *ex cathedra*, on "every one who deals only with what

* British Critic, No. 59, pp. 131—134.

shallow-minded men call practical questions, that he is not a fit person to study morals, or any other science. Nature," says this Christian moralist, meaning, we presume the God of nature, though such things are strangely predicated of Him who hath "made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the earth,"—"Nature has intended you for a drudge and not for a leader; to obey others, without knowing why or wherefore. Be content with this: it is all you are fit for. And if you attempt to reason, you will only reason wrongly, and aid in bringing down the human mind to a poor and degraded vulgarity, both of thought and action. And be assured you will do infinite mischief. Men are sick of the shallow, superficial, meagre speculations, which these practical notions have engendered. They want depth, and mystery, and vastness. If they cannot find them in a true system, they will seek them in a false."*

How exactly the last sentence harmonizes with Mr. Newman's dictum about "feelings which may be especially called Catholic," quoted at the commencement of this article; how accurately it describes what the doctors, and after them the disciples of this school are doing, and would beguile others to do, will be seen in the sequel—we would only here note, how applicable is the former part to Dr. Arnold. *He* deals with a practical question, in a manner comprehensible by shallow-minded men—ergo, he is "intended for a drudge, and not for a leader, to obey others without knowing why or wherefore." *He* has "attempted to reason," therefore "he has reasoned wrongly." *He* has delineated, in a manner intelligible to all, Christian life, its course, its hindrances, and its helps; *he* has pointed out, in the simplest and most perspicuous language, "how every individual Christian may thus conduce in his measure to the restoration of Christ's Church with power; how this very generation may begin and make some progress in the work;" *he* calls upon good, and wise, and influential laymen to awake to a sense of their true position and duties, and as every man hath received a gift, to minister the same to others, as a good steward of the manifold grace of God;—ergo, he is aiding "to bring down the human mind to a poor and degraded vulgarity both of thought and action." This vulgarity of thought, however, being the participation of "like precious faith"—this vulgarity of action being the practice of that holiness, which is so integral and inseparable a part of the common salvation, that, without it, "no man can see the Lord," we do not think Dr. Arnold will be much moved by the assurance even of the Professor,

* Sewell's Christian Morals, p. 124.

"that he is doing infinite mischief." However "sick men may be of shallow, superficial, meagre speculations, engendered by practical notions," Dr. Arnold thinks that the best mode of recovering them is to place them upon a regimen of simple and salutary diet, instead of administering a double dose of the opiate of mystery, or steeping them in the Lethæan waters of tradition and antiquity; and considers himself more usefully occupied, as a disciple of the great Physician, in endeavouring to attach men to the true system, than to "attract them to a false."

"But we want depth, and mystery, and vastness," says Mr. Sewell. "We want free scope," echoes Mr. Newman, "for feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may especially be called Catholic." And where are we to find what we want? Mr. Sewell, being but a sub-apostolical, tells us only where we are to seek it; "in a system that is false." Mr. Newman tells us more plainly where it is to be found, "The one religious communion among us which has of late years been practically in possession of this something is—the Church of Rome." Dr. Pusey holds, that "what is catholic and uncatholic is so strangely blended together in the Roman system, that if what is uncatholic repels not, what is catholic must win: "* and in the latest production of the school, it is unequivocally declared that "as we go on, we must recede from the principles, *if any such there be*, of the English Reformation." † Now we *are* going on—we are even making *great* progress—according to Mr. Newman; and the question is, if so, "From what are we receding, and towards what are we advancing?" We are receding from the principles of the English Reformation, which are embodied, notwithstanding the sneer of the Tractarian Critic, in the xxxix Articles of the English Church; and we are advancing towards "a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Instead of standing fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, we are about to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage; "in unauthorized or over-urged human observances and traditions, which," says Bishop Wilson, "are always found to sap the foundation of a penitent sinner's hope in the alone satisfaction and atonement of Christ. ‡ We are advancing towards the evil which Mr. Newman, having destroyed Christ's Church, would set up in its stead—and "the mystery of this iniquity doth already work." "Catholic minds," we are told, "are unable to see their way"—and how should it be otherwise, when the *soi-disant* teachers of Catholicism are often misunderstood by each other, even if charity can credit them with

* Apology for No. 90, p. 156.

† British Critic, No. 59, p. 45.

‡ Bishop Wilson's Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Calcutta, 1838.

understanding themselves—when the torch which they bear as a guide to the uninitiated, bewilders those with its smoke whom it should rather guide with its light, and when the path, whether of retrogression or advance, is so enveloped in obscurity, that even they themselves are “utterly in the dark—new portents rising up every day, disappointing all past successors, and baffling all calculation for the future.” But there is a reason for this—they can no longer say, “Thy word is a light to my feet and a lamp to my paths;” and we who will not follow, but who cannot recal them, only reiterate the caution which is in fact the substance and epitome of Dr. Arnold’s admirable preface, “Take heed that the light which is in thee be not darkness!”

We cannot but direct the attention of our readers, in conclusion, to the opposite modes of teaching which are adopted by Dr. Arnold and the Tractarians—the one, all plainness and perspicuity—sound sense, forcible language, cogent and conclusive reasoning—the other, shrouded in a veil of obscurity which baffles even the most erudite and discerning reader. Dr. Arnold, with all his desire to know what Mr. Newman and his friends say, has formed, as Dr. Pusey insinuates, an incorrect estimate of their views; Archbishop Laurence “found it no easy task perfectly and consistently to comprehend Mr. Newman’s precise meaning;” * the Master of the Temple believes “that many of their statements are confused and vague, their argument inconclusive, and their opinions, upon several points, indeterminate, exaggerated and erroneous;” † Dr. Thorpe (who has published a sensible and seasonable Review of the Christian Morals and other writings of Professor Sewell) declares that he read and read the Christian Morals, “till his head whirled round like a smokejack;” ‡ and by a kind of retributive justice, the Professor himself is equally bewildered by No. 90, upon which he “does not presume to assert that he has caught the real meaning of the author;” and he states the fact of his misconception as an apology for others, who may have been similarly misled with himself—but who will, of course, be reconciled to error in company of Plato and Professor Sewell. Obviously then, if *such* minds are unable to see their way, we cannot expect but that the great mass of mankind should be placed beyond the range of teaching such as this,—*Odi profanum vulgus, et arceo*—is virtually the language of the high priests of this sect, or we may find a better parallel to it in a more fitting place, “This people, which knoweth not the law, are cursed.”

* Remarks on Newman’s Lectures on Justification.

† Benson’s Discourses on Tradition and Episcopacy. Third Edition, 1840.

‡ Thorpe’s Review of Sewell’s Letter, &c.

We will not, however, be induced, by any yearning after depth, mystery, and vastness, to accept intricacy instead of vastness, and obscurity instead of depth; to seek in a false system what we cannot find in the true; to cherish and cultivate feelings which may be "especially called Catholic;" but disprove their title to the name, in that they can only find "full scope" within the Church of Rome. We recollect to have read of One, whom all ministers should follow and all Churches obey, who tested His divine mission by the fulfilment of the prophecy, that "to the poor the gospel was preached"—and whom, though he spake words which never man spake, the common people heard gladly, because they heard intelligently. We will never recognize the note of divine teaching, in that which doctors cannot explain, professors cannot interpret, archbishops cannot understand. We take mysticism and reserve as "notes" of error, if not as tokens of imposture. We repudiate with indignation and abhorrence the presumptuous and most unscriptural doctrine of Professor Sewell, that there is a portion of mankind who are "made to obey others, not knowing why or wherefore." Obedience in things lawful is a Christian duty—ignorance of the grounds on which that obedience is required, if involuntary, is a misfortune, and, if wilful, is a sin. It is quite enough to condemn the system of Rome, that it begins by bandaging the eyes—it does not recommend that of Oxford, that it excites a cloud of dust, or condenses a haziness of vapour, through which "Catholic minds are unable to see their way." And we cannot but adopt the forcible words of the Metropolitan of India, that "the false principle will go on eating as doth a canker if things proceed as they do now. The inspired word of God will be imperceptibly neglected, and the traditions of men will take its place. The Church will supersede the Bible. The sacraments will hide the glory of Christ. Self-righteousness will conceal the righteousness of God, traditions and Fathers will occupy the first place, as we see in the sermons of the chief Roman Catholic authors of every age; the operations of the Holy Ghost in creating man anew will be more and more forgotten; the nature of those good works which are acceptable to God in Christ will be lost sight of—and another gospel, framed on the traditions of men, will make way for an apostacy in our own Church, as in that of Rome, unless indeed the evangelical piety, the reverence for holy scripture, the theological learning, and the forethought and fidelity of our divines of dignified station and established repute, interfere by distinct cautions to prevent it." *

* Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Calcutta, 1838.

Dr. Arnold, among others, has, happily, thus interposed—and his caution is distinct, as to the danger of overvaluing the ministry of men. Dr. Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel, has followed in the same track, in his sermon before the University of Oxford, preached Oct. 25th, 1840. Archbishop Whately, as will appear from the passage already cited, has borne his powerful testimony against the blind submission to clerical dogmatism which is dignified at Oxford by the prostituted name of faith. And thus Oriel itself has furnished a threefold cord which cannot be quickly broken, and which, by God's blessing, may restrain the movement of the age towards Rome, and draw it, as with a cord of love, to seek satisfaction where alone it can be found—in holy scripture, which containeth all things necessary to salvation!

We have found so much material for grave consideration in Dr. Arnold's introduction, that we must postpone our examination of the volume itself to a future opportunity. We wish, in the meantime, that the author could be prevailed upon to publish his invaluable preface in a separate form. Placed as it is, it seems to impart a controversial character to the entire work, and may cause ordinary readers, daunted by the apparent bulk of the volume, to remain in ignorance of its sterling value, as well as to overlook the introduction itself, one of the best refutations of the errors of this mystical school, (not to use a stronger term) to which the controversy has given rise. We now take leave of the subject, for the present, with an extract from Waterland (whose works, we observe, are admitted into the list of books to be profitably studied by those who are seeking "something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century") an extract, which will at least prove that Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman are themselves disciples of that which they so cordially abhor and condemn—"A MODERN SCHOOL."

"Franciscus a Sancta Clara, a known Papist (who published his book A.D. 1634), contrived to make our Thirty-nine Articles speak his own sentiments, reconciling them with great dexterity and amazing subtlety to the Council of Trent. Now, put the question, whether upon his thus professing his faith in Protestant terms, popishly interpreted, he could justly claim every privilege of a Church of England man, and whether we were bound to receive him as a fellow-Protestant? A very little share of common sense, I presume, will be sufficient to determine the question in the negative."*

* Waterland on the Trinity.

ASHANTEE AND THE GOLD COAST. By JOHN BEECHAM.
London: *Mason*. 1841.

THE name of Ashantée, or more correctly As-hánti, was first extensively made known to the British public by the defeat of the force commanded by the unfortunate Sir Charles M'Carthy in the year 1824.

The circumstances of barbarity which accompanied that disastrous affair, naturally produced a very unfavourable impression concerning the character of the African tribes, more especially the Ashantees. And in one respect that impression has since been abundantly confirmed. The heathen natives of Western Africa are, by the concurrent testimony of all who have visited them, blinded slaves of perhaps the bloodiest, the most ferocious superstition that ever disgraced any people upon earth.

The abominations of our own druidical worship, not excepting the wicker idol stuffed full of human victims, sink into insignificance when compared with the unspeakable horrors "presented to the eyes of the beholder at the courts of Benin and Dahomy, and at Ardrah, Badassy and Coomassie," * (the capital of Ashantee,) in short from the western limits of Ashantee to the delta of the Niger. "It is," says Mr. M'Queen, "not only the common, but almost the daily custom for the sovereign and chief men in every nation to soak their thrones and footstools with the warm blood of their fellow-creatures; to carry their bones bared of their flesh before them in triumph, and to adorn their war drums, their war accoutrements, their palaces, and their apartments, and above all the temples of their grovelling deities, with human skulls and bones."

This appalling statement is fully borne out by the evidence of such eye-witnesses as Bowdich, Dupuis, Laing, Williams (secretary to Governor M'Carthy), Clapperton, Lander, &c. The description, given by the last-mentioned, of "the Fetische-tree," "bending under its load of human flesh and bones" is absolutely sickening. What must be the effect of beholding the reality!

Mr. Beecham, in the book named at the head of this article, refers these horrors to the only cause adequate, in our judgment, to produce them. At page 250 we find him speaking thus:—

"A careful examination of the national religion unfolds the true source of the barbarous practices which so extensively prevail. Was nothing known of the superstitions of the people, it might remain a matter of doubt, whether

* M'Queen's Geographical Survey of Africa.

in the wholesale butchery of their enemies they were not merely indulging their own savage instincts like the wild beasts of the forest."

Again, at page 254:—

"When once it is ascertained that a people are thoroughly imbued with the persuasion, that the deities, whom they regard as the arbiters of their own fate, require human sacrifices as the most acceptable offerings which their votaries can possibly present; that those deities, in fact, employ themselves in promoting and fomenting war, in order that their altars may continually reek with blood;—when once it is found that such a persuasion is the governing principle, the dreadful scenes which occur in Ashantee cease to create surprise, as it is evident that such practices must naturally result from such deep-rooted and prevalent principles."

Besides the desire to purchase the favour of their sanguinary gods, or to speak more truly, the anxiety to avert or appease their wrath which their wretched superstition generates, there is also another consideration owing its birth to the same prolific source of evil. It is believed that a man's rank in this life determines also his station in the life that is to come—a king continues after death to enjoy and exercise the prerogatives of royalty—a chief has also his proper dignity assigned him—and a slave fills the same degraded station which he filled whilst an inhabitant of earth. This being the case, it follows, that as soon as a person of high rank has paid the debt of nature, his surviving friends cannot possibly manifest their affection towards him, and their concern for his happiness so strongly, as by sacrificing on his grave all his wives, and a numerous retinue of slaves, either members of his household while living, or captives taken in war. These unhappy beings pass, it is imagined, into the presence of their deceased lord, and enter upon the various duties which their temporary separation from him had interrupted.

The reader will now be prepared to understand how Mr. Beecham, quoting from Dupuis, can describe the King of Ashantee as delighting in the recollection of feats of war and bloodshed which he had performed—as "wrapped up within himself in delightful cogitations"—as insulting the memory of his fallen enemy by exclaiming aloud, "His skull was broken, but I would not lose the trophy, and now I have made a similar skull of gold"—as compelling a captive prince to witness the spectacle of his brother's death by cruel tortures, to join also in singing the epicedium or "death-song"—and yet as being at the very same time *by nature* "the reverse" of ferocious and savage—"polite and affable in his general manners, and especially characterised by his tender and affectionate treatment of his children."

"To his *religion*," says our Author, "the fearful traits in his character must be traced. That taught him to regard his captive as an implacable foe,

who would carry his enmity beyond the grave, and of whom, as an evil spirit, even after death he would have to beware. That instructed him, moreover, to believe that the torture and sacrifice of an enemy are peculiarly acceptable to the deities whom he worshipped. 'A negro,' says Dupuis, 'can hardly be persuaded that an enemy might be converted into a friend; and as he naturally thirsts after his gold, if he is so far successful, nothing can satiate him short of his opponent's blood, which is esteemed the portion of the spoil due to the tutelar gods (and acceptable to the shades of his ancestors), whose service it is incumbent on him not to neglect, lest their wrath should overwhelm him on a future day.' This solves the difficulty, and shows on what principle the most diabolical revenge is sometimes combined in the same individual with great natural affection."—(p. 254.)

We are thoroughly agreed with our intelligent author that this is the true solution of the difficulty, and we think that without travelling beyond the limits of his instructive history we find enough to set the question at rest. Having furnished his readers with a faithful description of the cruel and sanguinary observances of the Ashantee court and nobility, and having shewn their intimate connexion with the national belief, he proceeds still further to establish his position by exhibiting a lively picture of the change produced by the introduction of Christianity.

The last two chapters are, for this reason, by far the most valuable and interesting in Mr. Beecham's volume. Indeed we have seldom risen from the perusal of any narrative with a deeper sense of thankfulness to God for his goodness in so far blessing the labours of his servants, and a stronger and clearer conviction of the duty incumbent upon us to exert ourselves for the welfare, temporal and spiritual, of the degraded but most improvable African. We propose, as the highest gratification we can confer upon our readers, to set before them an outline of Mr. Beecham's relation, in this closing part of his work. For ampler details than our limits will admit, we must refer them to the work itself.

Before, however, we enter upon the task which we have thus proposed to ourselves, we must make a single citation from our author, upon the subject of Ashantee manufactures, our main design being to establish the capability of the native mind, when not under the dominion of those baneful influences which either prostrate its energies in the dust, or enlist them on the side of whatever is terrible in the history of sinful human nature.

"The Ashantees and Fantees are ingenious artists in the precious metal which their country produces. Among the specimens of native manufacture which the writer has had the opportunity of examining were chains and rings, executed in a very creditable manner. The writer has been told by an artist in London, that a valuable gold chain of English manufacture, which had been repaired by a native of the Gold Coast, was put into his hands by the owner, and that he was not able, after a careful examination, to point out the new links which had been added. Some of the rings are of solid gold, ornamented with various devices; others are formed of a hoop,

entwined with net-work; and others again, which enlarge or contract, according to the size of the finger, are composed entirely of gold net-work. The Ashantee artists are expert in moulding gold into the form of birds, fishes, and various animals.

"Iron is also manufactured to a considerable extent; and some of the swords made by the Ashantees are said to show very fine workmanship.

"The native carpenters' work is not despicable. The writer has before him a stool, made of a white, soft wood, neatly carved; and a low chair, brought by Mr. Freeman from the interior, which displays considerable taste—it also is made of white wood, and carved, and is studded all over with brass nails: the bottom is of strong leather. The chair shuts up like a camp-stool, and has, on the whole, a somewhat elegant appearance.

"The tanning of leather is also understood. The writer has in his possession a large round cushion, made of red-coloured leather, ingeniously ornamented with various devices cut in the substance with a knife. The cushion is stuffed with the cotton produced by the silk-cotton tree.

"Various specimens of pipe-heads, bought by Mr. Freeman in the market of Coomassie, similar to those sent by Bowdich, with one of the above-mentioned cushions, to the British Museum, support the favourable opinion which that traveller has given of Ashantee pottery.

"The art of weaving has made considerable progress among the Ashantees. The principle of their looms is that of the hand-loom of the English; but the web which they manufacture never exceeds four inches in breadth. They purchase the richest silks, in order to unravel and interweave them with their own thread; and their best cloths are extolled for their fineness, variety, brilliance, and size. The colours used by them in dying are, red, blue, and yellow, and a green produced by a union of the two last-mentioned colours.

"In Ashantee the several arts and manufactures are in some cases carried on in the same town. Dumpási, for instance, is mentioned by Bowdich as a very industrious town, where cloth, beads, and pottery were manufactured in all directions; and the blacksmith's bellows were always at work. At other places only one kind of manufacture is found, as at Díatasú, the inhabitants of which are exclusively employed in potteries; and at Asiminia, where almost the entire population is engaged in weaving."—(pp. 146—148.)

We proceed to the narration which we have promised our readers.

In the year 1751 the first attempt on record to introduce the gospel into Western Africa was made by "the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts." The Rev. Thomas Thompson, afterwards vicar of Reculver in Kent, who for a considerable time had been engaged in the work of the ministry in the American colonies, was at the period we have mentioned deputed to the British settlement at Cape Coast Castle. There, as he has himself informed us in a history of his expedition published in 1758, he remained during four years. The chief result of his visit, so far as the Africans were concerned, appears to have been the transmission to England, with a view to their education, of three native boys.

The subsequent career of one of these youths was not a little singular. After acquiring the rudiments of learning under the care of Mr. Hickman of Islington, he was sent to the University of Oxford,

and, at length, having passed through the usual course of study, ordained, he was then restored to his native country, and for more than fifty years," says Mr. Beecham, "officiated as chaplain at Cape Coast Castle." What degree of success attended his ministry during that long period, whether amongst the whites or persons of his own colour, we are not informed. But we may safely infer that the amount could not have been large, when we read the melancholy statement, that "on his death-bed he gave evidence that he had at least as much confidence in the influence of the fetische as in the power of Christianity." We must not withhold from our readers the just and striking remarks which Mr. Beecham makes upon this strange narrative:—

"The case of this individual furnishes matter for grave consideration on the part of those who are anxious to promote the enlightenment and elevation of Africa. It yields no support to the plausible theory of Christianizing Pagan lands, primarily or chiefly, by bringing natives to this country for education, with a view to their becoming the principal instructors of their countrymen; and shows that if, on their return, they are left to their own resources, it is more likely that they will sink down again to the level of their former state, than that they will prove the regenerators of their country. Instructed natives may maintain their consistency, and act a useful part, where they are placed under the eye and direction of European missionaries; but if they be thrown back into heathen society without such support, it ought not to excite surprise, should the result prove that the time and care bestowed upon their culture have been expended in vain."—(pp. 258, 259.)

About twelve years ago the Missionary Society at Basle commenced a mission, first at Liberia, and then on the Danish Gold Coast. As this attempt has hitherto, owing to various untoward circumstances, exerted but little influence over the native mind, it is needless for us at present to do more than mention the fact of its having been made.

It appears that in the month of October, 1831, some young men, who had been taught to read the Bible in the government school at Cape Coast Castle, and whose hearts had been impressed with a sense of its supreme importance, formed themselves into a little society which they called "the Meeting or Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." At a subsequent period one of these interesting youths applied to the master of an English merchant-vessel trading from Bristol to Western Africa, requesting him to purchase, on his return home, sundry copies of the Scriptures, and to bring them with him on his next voyage. Captain Potter, the person charged with this commission, was a man of piety. He undertook, not only to procure the books, but to engage, if possible, the services of a Christian teacher in behalf of his African acquaintances. The result was the commencement of a mission to the Gold Coast, by the committee of the Wesleyan

Society. This was in the latter end of 1834. By the first of January following, their missionary, Mr. Dunwell, had landed at Cape Coast, and commenced his labours. The manner in which this good man was received and welcomed may be understood from the following sentence in his first report to his employers:—
 “Joy beamed on every countenance—their gratitude is without bounds—they say, ‘We did never think of the missionary’s coming to teach black men.’”

It is impossible for us to enter into lengthened details of the mission thus auspiciously commenced. We must hasten on. Within eighteen short months of his landing upon those fatal shores, Mr. Dunwell was called away to the eternal world. Very beautiful is the language in which the native converts recorded, in their minute-book, their determination to continue faithful—“We will remain in the new profession (Christianity), for though the missionary is dead, God lives.”

Since the period of Mr. Dunwell’s decease, in June, 1835, others of his countrymen have not failed to follow in his track, and some of them, like him, have already exchanged the toil and anxiety of the missionary’s life for an immortal crown. “They rest,” indeed, “from their labours,” but “their works do follow them;” and this is the part of the subject to which we must confine our attention at present. What, then, has been the effect produced upon the native character by the introduction of Christianity up to the date of Mr. Beecham’s publication, in March, 1841? Hear the just and sensible remarks with which our Author prefaces his answer to this inquiry:—

“It is a fact that travellers and others, who have opportunity of personally observing the proceedings of missionaries in heathen lands, do not always sufficiently appreciate the effects of their teaching. An unfair criterion is frequently adopted; either the attainments of the native converts are compared with the acquirements of Christians in enlightened and civilized countries, or in some way the disadvantages in their condition are overlooked; and as a natural result, all the benefits which have actually resulted from the instructions of the missionaries are not perceived and acknowledged. Duly to estimate the change which has been effected by missionary labours, the present state of the people whose benefit has been sought should be contrasted with their former heathen condition; and the comparison ought to be instituted under the full impression of the truth, that the elevation of a people from the depths of barbarism is not the work of a day.”—(pp. 298, 299.)

We would that all travellers carefully stored up these observations in their memory. We should, in that case, hear much less than we are accustomed to hear of the want of success, or of the slight measure of success, resulting from the efforts of Christian teachers amongst the heathen.

The benefits derivable from Christianity, by a heathen people,

may be divided into mediate and immediate. The latter will include all those which are of a moral and spiritual nature, while to the former may be referred such as are connected with their civilization, and general advancement in temporal prosperity. It is delightful to know, that in the case of nations emerging from darkness into light, both of these are sure to go hand in hand. *Individuals* may be sorely tried—their temporal condition may become apparently more wretched by the change, but *the aggregate, the collective body*, cannot but be gainers. Thus it is that God makes good his word, “that godliness has the promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come.”

The *immediate* benefits resulting to the natives of the Gold Coast from Christian instruction have been, the abolition in numerous instances of their heathen superstitions—the establishment amongst them of the worship of the only true God—the peaceful enjoyment of the Christian sabbath—the improvement of their morals, profligacy, lying, and theft beginning to disappear—the awakening of natural affections long dormant in the breast, under the disastrous influence of heathenism—the present comfort and enjoyment of the Gospel—and a hope full of immortality in the hour of death.

Listen to our Author speaking on this last point:—

“In his last hours, the native convert is not now surrounded by fetische priests, practising their incantations for his recovery; but freed from superstitious fears, he commends, with calm confidence, his departing spirit into the hands of his Lord and Saviour; and the funeral procession which accompanies his corpse to the grave stands out in such pleasing contrast to the revolting scenes which heathen funerals exhibit, that many of the idolaters are led to acknowledge the superiority of the Christian religion over their degrading and inhuman superstitions.”—(p. 300.)

As an illustration of a new and improved morality, take the following:—

“A native convert was employed in conveying goods to an English vessel. Having returned to the shore, he found that he had accidentally overlooked a quantity of ivory, amounting in value to thirty pounds sterling; and he immediately put off again in his canoe, with the intention of giving it to the captain. The vessel, however, had proceeded so far that he was not able to overtake it: and on his return he went immediately to the castle, and placed the property in the keeping of the President of the Council, to be restored to the captain on his next voyage.”—(pp. 300, 301.)

Amongst the temporal blessings which are to be traced to the benign influence of Christianity are the following—deliverance from the terrors of a violent and cruel death, beneath the horrible Fetische tree, or upon the grave of some deceased chieftain—the abolition of polygamy—the becoming treatment of women—the

growth of "a taste for the decencies and comforts of European life"—the comparative security of property, and the increased industry of the native converts.

It had been our intention, considering our limited space, to furnish our readers with an abstract merely of the interesting matters contained in the following passage. On second thoughts, however, we are persuaded that they will be found far too solid and valuable to be submitted to any process of condensation.

"The spirit of industry and desire for general improvement, which have been excited, are strikingly evidenced by the fact, that many of the Christian natives applied to Mr. Freeman to obtain for them while he was in England, the means of introducing an improved method of agriculture, and such other assistance as would enable them to advance more rapidly towards a state of civilization. An extract from a report on this subject, drawn up by Mr. Freeman during his visit to this country, will be read with interest. After expressing a decided opinion of the practicability of Sir T. Fowell Buxton's plans for the instruction and elevation of the natives of Africa, he proceeds:—

"It is with great pleasure I state that many of the natives of Fantee, with whom I have had frequent intercourse, and who have already laid aside their heathen errors and embraced Christianity, are very anxious to engage in agricultural pursuits; and have requested me to render them some assistance, by taking out for them, on my return to Africa, a supply of seeds, implements of husbandry, and any thing that would be useful in cultivating their native soil. At Domonási, a small Fantee town, about twenty-five miles in the interior, there is a little band of Christians, about sixty in number, with the young chief of the district at their head, who are now anxiously waiting my return with a supply of the above-mentioned things. There are also many of the natives of Cape Coast and Annamaboe, who have small plantations in the bush, at a distance of from three to ten miles from these towns, who are now turning their attention, more fully than they have ever done before, to the cultivation of the soil. These requests on the part of the natives have impressed our minds with the importance of establishing, at the earliest opportunity, two model-farms in the interior of Fantee; that we may thereby have the means of teaching them the best methods of culture, and of showing them the very great capabilities of the soil. One of these farms will be established at Domonási, and the other at Mansu, formerly the great slave-mart, and still a considerable town and district, about fifty miles on the road to Ashantee. In each of these places a residence for a missionary is now being prepared, and we hope that in the course of a few months both these posts will be occupied; when one of the great objects of the missionaries will be that of instructing in the practical science of agriculture all those natives, whether Christians or Heathens, who may feel disposed to turn their attention to it."

"The moral improvement which has already taken place in Domonási, is beginning to have a powerful influence on the social condition of the people. Their houses are kept more clean and decent than those of the heathen, and they are imbibing a taste for those many domestic comforts and conveniences, which are to be found in a European cottage. Several of them are beginning to wear European clothes, and have requested me to take them out a fresh supply, on my return from England. The effects produced in the minds of the heathen in the surrounding neighbourhood, by these salutary changes, are also becoming strikingly manifest. They begin to admire the improved social condition of their Domonási neighbours, often calling their town "a white man's croom;" and, as a natural consequence, they are now feeling, in some measure, at least, a respect for that religion which has been the cause of such a beneficial change."—(pp. 303—306.)

Mr. Beecham's earlier chapters, which furnish us with a history of Ashantee, especially of its intercourse with the tribes upon the coast and the white settlers from Europe, and the latter part of his last chapter in which he relates a visit made by Mr. Freeman, the missionary, to the court and capital of Ashantee, we have found ourselves compelled to leave unnoticed. The circumstances of the history, although of much intrinsic interest and importance, are beside our immediate object in the present article, and Mr. Freeman's journey we must not now venture to take up.

With a threefold end in view, *first*, to show the puerile nature of the African superstitions; *secondly*, to exhibit the powerful influence exercised over the minds of the natives by the Fetische men, those vile impostors of whom they are the voluntary dupes; and, *thirdly*, to leave our readers in good humour with Mr. Beecham and ourselves, we shall cite one passage more from the work which has formed the subject of the present article:—

“ Shortly after the commencement of the Wesleyan mission, a fetische, named Akwah, came from the interior to Cape Coast town, who professed to be able, when he had bruised a bead to powder, to unite the particles together again, and make it what it was before. Several persons put his skill to the test, and he contrived so adroitly to slip other beads into the places of the powdered ones, that the spectators were led to believe that he had really restored the broken beads to their former state. He professed, moreover, that he could thrust his finger through a stone, and produced one with a hole in it, which hole he said was made by his finger; and he managed to obtain credit with the people for having done it, although they did not see the alleged feat performed. He stated, moreover, that he had sufficient influence to call apes from the bush, and make them talk with the people; but that he could not do this in the daytime, because he said the apes were timid, and shunned the light. He therefore took his dupes into the bush after dark, and they returned into the town perfectly satisfied that they had conversed with apes. By such exploits he gained great renown, and considerable profit; and then proceeded to Glimna, and Commenda, and having convinced the people there of the great powers of his fetische, he returned to Cape Coast town.

“ After his return, a native trader possessed of some wealth, was taken ill, and consulted Akwah, who engaged speedily to restore him to health. The trader then expressed a wish to witness some of the great feats of which he had heard so much, and especially desired to hear the apes talk. Akwah was quite ready to comply with his request; but as the apes were still averse to the light, it was arranged that the meeting should be deferred until eight o'clock in the evening. The gospel was, however, just beginning to exert sufficient influence upon the mind of the trader to awaken some doubt as to the powers of the fetischeman; and he resolved to use every precaution to prevent himself from being imposed upon. He accordingly instructed his servant boys, who were to accompany him with a present of rum, to take care to ascertain who or what it was to whom they gave it; and at the appointed time, taking four flasks of rum, containing about one gallon, he proceeded to the appointed place, near to the spot where the mission-house now stands. All things being ready, Akwah began to call for the apes, telling them that a man of distinction had come to hear them, and begging them to honour his fetische by obeying the summons. At length a rushing noise was heard in the bush, and a small voice proceeded from it, saying,

'We are come: give us some rum.' The trader immediately sprang forward, saying, 'I will give it to them;' but Akwah interposed, telling him that it would be more consistent with his dignity to sit down, and allow his servants to perform the duty. Little, however, did Akwah suspect that the boys had been previously instructed as to the part which they should act, or anticipate the result which followed. The boys took the flasks, and thrust them into the bush whence the voices proceeded; and each, as he extended a flask in one hand, stretched out also the other, that he might be able to ascertain, by feeling, what was the recipient. It being quite dark, this manœuvre could not be perceived; and immediately one of the boys called out to his master, 'My father, my father! it is not an ape; I have caught a boy's hand.' 'Hold it fast,' replied the trader, 'until I come and satisfy myself;' but in the struggle which ensued the captive gained his liberty, and the trader and his boys pursued the fugitives, and ascertained that they were a number of boys who had been trained by Akwah to personate apes.

"On their return to the bush, the trader and his servants found that the fetische boys, in their haste, had left the bottles they had brought, into which to empty the trader's flasks for the use of their master; but Akwah himself had taken to his heels, and was never seen or heard of more at Cape Coast town. This discovery broke the spell with which the popular superstition had bound the mind of the trader, and he soon after became a member of Christian society."—(pp. 290—293.)

RELIGION THE STRENGTH OF CONSERVATISM. *A*
Dialogue. London: Hatchard. 1841.

AN impression is generally prevalent, at the present moment, and a very natural one it must be allowed, under existing circumstances, to be,—that a great change is about to pass over this kingdom; that the course and system of policy which has borne sway in England for the last ten or eleven years, is shortly to give way to an entirely different one; and that "a new leaf" must be turned over, the inscription on which no mortal eye has yet been permitted to read. Unquestionably the progress of events has latterly appeared to bring us to the very threshold of such a change. And the apparent nearness and evident importance of the crisis will do more than excuse, it will even prescribe and compel a departure from our ordinary rule, of abstinence from politics; and will render it a clear and unquestionable duty to say a few words on the present position of public affairs; and more especially on the aspirations and efforts which become a Christian, in a posture of public affairs such as that into which we are now passing.

And first, then, of what a Christian should chiefly keep in view, as the thing to be most desired for his day and generation. And on this point we must begin by deprecating the universal error, into which all seem ready to fall, and from which we ourselves by no means

claim exemption,—of building confident hopes on statesmen, and parties, and human schemes and improvements;—expecting almost the millennium itself to appear, if only certain combinations of events could but be ordered according to our desirings. Every kind of fancy which approaches this,—and something resembling it is perpetually haunting us,—is a positive delusion, altogether at variance with God's word, and certain to land us, at last, in disgust and disappointment.

We profess the principles usually called “Conservative;” and we shall presently have to argue against the notion espoused by a few excellent persons in the present day,—that “Christians have nothing to do with politics.” Yet, while occupying this position, we are equally desirous that these concerns of the “lower world” should be kept in the subordinate rank which properly belongs to them; and should never, for a moment, be allowed to rise into the same estimation with “the things of the kingdom of heaven.”

Are we cautioning ourselves and our readers against errors which have no existence? Do none of us ever find ourselves indulging in day-dreams of imaginary cabinets, ruling the Church and the State in the fear of God? Is it easy to avoid, sometimes, wishing for the elevation of Lord —— to this post, or Mr. —— to that; and then calculating onwards to the nomination of this or the other eminent minister to the episcopal bench; until, at last, we are ready to think that if we could but have the ordering of these things for a few months or years, we could so arrange matters as to bring the Church almost into the millennial state!

The two things which we usually overlook in these calculations are,—1. The never-ceasing machinations of Satan—and 2. The uncertain materials of which a great part of our aerial castles (or rather temples) must necessarily be constructed.

We were not a little surprised, a few days since, to find an unusually strong enforcement of these cautions in a quarter whence we least expected it. In the recent number of the *British Critic* appeared the following free and scarcely friendly remarks on the character of the Conservative leader:—

“The man who offers these consolations is one whose life, and breath, and health, and wealth, and very being is the success of his party; the least abstract, the least theoretical, the least doctrinary of all the statesmen of his day; one whose pulse beats with the divisions of the House of Commons, and who knows by heart the relative numbers on every tussle of faction for the last quarter, or, perhaps, half a century. He is a man who, amiable and respectable as he is, plays his part in the great arena with no more largeness and comprehensiveness of view, no more grandeur and sacredness of principle, than the most ordinary partizan in the most local squabble on the most ephemeral interests. Nay, greatness of mind has nothing to do with geographical extent or historical duration. A man may be great on a

paving and lighting dispute, or a watch and ward committee; he may be great with his servants, or by himself; but Sir Robert is small with nations, petty with a constitution of ages, and (we say it sadly and seriously) unfaithful to the everlasting Catholic Church. He wishes to know nothing beyond the House of Commons. Its resolutions, passed in heat and speed, under royal or popular domination, in days of corruption or violence, its chance majorities of ten, two, or one, are his inviolable canons of legislation, beyond which he dreams not of a principle. That House of Commons, which the whole Church of England now, with a unanimity unprecedented in the history of public opinion, declares that Sir Robert has himself desecrated, and (what, of course, he thinks much worse) which he himself believes others have since immeasurably vulgarized,—that profane and vulgar House of Commons, is his only reality. Every other thing or thought to him is form and shadow. To the House of Commons he is thoroughly harmonized, soul and body, mind and manner. In vain might we search through his speeches for splendid theories, large inductions, universal sentiments, great maxims, solemn sanctions, profound arguments, and immutable principles; or if one does find them here and there, they are so brought in as to be the exceptions that prove the rule. From beginning to end his career is one of shifts and expedients. Neither he, nor any man on earth, can venture to say what he will do next; nor can any say what he has done already, in terms implying intention and consistency. We firmly believe, that no half-cunning tool of a local faction, no jobbing attorney, no town meddler, or corporation *factotum*, could more degrade civic economy by his way of administering it, or in the hour of reverse, when called to account by the adverse party, could more degrade the cause by his mode of speaking about it, than does the Conservative leader degrade the noble science of policy. It is '*I and my party*,' throughout; 'those members who did me the honour to support *me*;' 'when her Majesty called *me* to preside in her councils;' '*I* thought best to dissolve;' 'the first session of *my* parliament;' 'such were the opinions *I* then advocated;' 'the long and arduous struggle *I* have maintained;' '*I* then felt;' '*I* therefore resolved to *abdicate* office;' 'the sentiments which influenced *me* on that occasion;' 'the difficulties of *my* position;' 'the origin of *my* family;' 'the scenes of *my* youth;' and so on, through every possible variety of egotism. Strike the first person out of Sir Robert's speech, aye, out of his whole career, and they become a rope untwisted, a net unknotted, a ship unnailed and unpinned. We stop, not because we have not more to say, for we consider Sir Robert Peel's egotism about as copious a subject as one might wish to write upon, seeing it pervades his every word and deed; but because it is odious thus to speak of a man for whom we cannot help wishing well. We believe him to be a kind, an amiable, and, to some extent, a disinterested and magnanimous man. His friends, who have, of course, abundant opportunities of knowing it, say that he is; and what is even more, his public conduct, through many a year of harass and mortification, betrays scarcely a particle of malice, jealousy, or revenge. But, alas for a little magnanimity—for martyrdom to an influential minority—for ignorance that the whole is greater than a part. Strip Sir Robert of his inveterate self, and scatter the three hundred and odd gentlemen 'who do him the honour to support him,' to the four winds, and then perhaps he may become not only a good but a great man. But as it is, he is just the very last person in the whole world to advise a society of operatives to relinquish selfish, social, and party questions, and devote themselves wholly to the pleasures of science." *

Nor is this censure confined to the individual; but is made to include the entire party of which Sir Robert Peel is the head:—

* *British Critic*, July, pp. 59, 60.

“ For our part we would fain believe, but cannot—for every day would mock our credulity—that one of the two parties which now so evenly divide the legislature, is more a Church party than the other. We cannot persuade ourselves that it is not a mere selfish struggle for power, in which we have more reason to dread the Conservative than the Whig, inasmuch as the latter may possibly wish to prove himself a friend to the Church, and it is evidently the game of the former to conciliate the enemies of the Church, and at any price to win over the weak and wavering members of the Whig faction. At any rate we see no sign or token of sacredness in the self-styled Conservative body.” *

This is lofty, and almost contemptuous; but it accords entirely with the spirit which, at another page, denominates the turbulent A’Becket, one of “the blessed saints and martyrs of the Most High.” †

So far as the immediate interests of the party represented by the *British Critic* are concerned, the casual and superficial observer will be startled by these hostile demonstrations. But any one who has closely watched their advances will feel no surprise. The moment of Sir Robert Peel’s expected return to power is adroitly chosen for such a demonstration. He is thus distinctly warned that they will be no waiters at his footstool; no candidates for promotion; but that, if he would deal with them, it must be as with superiors, who will condescend to accept his homage, but who will pay him none.

Our business, however, at present, is not with them, or with their views or prospects; but with the question,—what is the right mood and temper of mind in which parties and party changes should be regarded by the Christian. And, touching this matter, we have no difficulty in declaring our assent to much that the above writer advances; although we consider his censure of Sir Robert Peel too unmeasured; and his own views, in one grand fundamental point, absolutely wrong.

Desiring to refrain from any vehement and perhaps premature condemnation of the Conservative leader, we would yet attempt to caution our readers against indulging too warm and sanguine expectations of the consequences to be anticipated from the approaching change. That change we believe to be highly desirable, and to be fraught with much promise to the country. But no one can have watched the course of events for a series of years, especially in the stirring times amidst which our lot is cast, without observing the perpetual irruption of cross-currents, side-winds, and other unlooked-for circumstances, which entirely baffle the wisest human calculations.

Cease, then,—we would say,—from cherishing unfounded hopes, of gathering the fruits of Paradise from the vines of Samaria. The

* *British Critic*, July, p. 68.

† *Ibid.* p. 42.

Church of Christ among us,—the true, spiritual Church,—is still but a “little flock.” The people of England are, in a vast and preponderating proportion, subjects, not of His kingdom, but of that of the “Prince of the power of the air.” And, such as the electoral bodies are, such must be the representatives. How, in such a system of government as that under which we live, can we look for a cabinet of Christians, save by some very extraordinary dispensation of Providence? But if this be the case, what more can we reasonably look for, on the whole, than tolerance, and perhaps sometimes a measure of kindness and regard?

Yet, while we thus endeavour to moderate hopes, and to guard against probable disappointment, we admit that there are some things which, from a government professing a regard for the Christian faith, and a belief in its truth and necessity, we may reasonably expect, and almost demand. The most obvious of these is CHURCH EXTENSION. With respect to this question, we evidently stand upon vantage ground. The lowest and meanest system of Conservatism professes firmly to maintain established institutions, and of course the Church among the foremost of the number. But it is nothing short of obvious hypocrisy, and is seen and felt to be such,—to admit the necessity and propriety of maintaining a Church *for the people*, and yet not to provide for the growth of that Church with the growth of the people. This is a paltriness to which nothing but that lowest of all exhibitions of human degradation,—modern liberalism,—ever could have stooped. The position is wholly untenable. The Church must be given up, as a *National Establishment*, or it must be extended, like all other national establishments, to meet the wants of the nation. In these external matters, then, we may reasonably expect something, from the accession to power, of men, who are in some degree pledged; and who are also, we would hope, really desirous of befriending the Church established in these realms. We may also calculate, at least for the present,—upon a cessation of those frequent and insidious attacks upon the Church, which, under the cabinets of the last ten years, have been constantly exciting our alarm. But when we have said thus much, have we not expressed every feeling, partaking of hope, in which Churchmen can rationally indulge?

On many other points, generally felt to be matters of interest, the best hope in which we can venture to indulge, is, that no positive mischief may be done. What reason can we possibly adduce, for expecting that the stream of human policy and worldly ambition should suddenly and miraculously rise higher than its source; or that the world should become the patron and fosterer of *that*

which for eighteen hundred years it has hated,—the true and spiritual church of Christ.

A disproportionate view, however, of these truths, is sometimes taken; and we are counselled to “let the dead bury their dead,” without ourselves taking the least interest or concern in such matters as mere earthly politics. The advice is generally well-intended, and proceeds from a view of the truth which is in the main a just one; but it is exaggerated into something altogether unpractical.

Is there anything in the histories or writings of the apostles, to lead us to suppose that it was their object to induce men to withdraw themselves from the society of human beings, or to shut themselves up in a kind of divine abstraction? On the contrary, do not the epistles, more especially, always address men as members of society; and as having obligations and duties arising out of that relation? To advert to a single point, merely,—is it not our bounden duty to keep continually in view, the one grand object of preaching Christ to every human being; but more especially, as far as we are concerned,—the preaching of the gospel to our own countrymen, and to those dwelling within our own empire? To accomplish these great objects by the unassisted agency of voluntary associations, is a thing which has been perpetually attempted for the last hundred and fifty years, but which is still left unaccomplished, and almost untouched. No one who is more intent on this great object than on the maintenance of his own theories, will venture to deny, at this time of day, that a practical man, aiming at this point by the most obvious and direct road, will seek to avail himself, as much as possible, of the half-enlightened conscience of existing governments, and will call forth, in any way that he can, their powerful aid in external preparations. Statesmen may have little perception of, and little care for, the one great essential—a change of heart,—and yet may readily and most effectually aid in planting and supporting preachers of the gospel, both abroad and at home. Henry Martyn was neither a self-supported missionary, nor was he sent forth by any voluntary association of Christians. He was appointed and maintained by a small body of men; the governors of the East, the Directors of the East India Company; among whom, probably, there were scarcely two persons who professed the least personal interest in that gospel which they were thus assisting to send forth.

Christians, then, clearly must take an interest in the affairs of human society, chiefly with a view to the furtherance of the Redeemer's kingdom. Nor can we see any rule laid down in the New Testament, which prohibits them from acquainting and con-

cerning themselves, in a cautious and guarded manner, with the general conduct of the community in which they are placed. Is it forbidden a Christian to take any part in the projected building of a bridge, or a new workhouse, in the parish in which he dwells? Is it criminal in him to care whether the new poor-law shall or shall not, be introduced into his district? If prohibitions of this kind cannot be asserted, how can a line be drawn between local and general affairs of state; or how shall the candidate for heaven be condemned, if he endeavours to form an opinion as to the relative merits of the rival candidates for a seat in the House of Commons? In all these things the scriptural rule, is not absolute seclusion, but heavenly-mindedness. "*It remaineth,*" therefore, "*that both they that have wives be as though they had none;*" "*and they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that*" "*rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as*" "*though they possessed not; and they that use this world, as*" "*not abusing it: for the fashion of this world passeth away.*"

But we need hardly urge this point at more length: the prevalent danger appears rather to lie on the other side. Some Christians, we are sorry to say, and even some leaders in the religious world, have satisfied themselves, not only that it is lawful to concern themselves in political questions, but further, that it is both right and expedient, in doing so, to throw off, for a time, the Christian character; and to go into the world, as those who are not only *in* it, but even *of* it.

The parties to whom we allude are chiefly those who interpret our Saviour's words, "My kingdom is not of this world," in a sense which forbids all commerce and connexion between the affairs of state and the affairs of the Church. And their conduct, in political affairs, lets in new light on their interpretation. It has been well said, by an advocate of the union of church and state, that "our object is, not to make the Church political, but to make "the State religious." The persons of whom we are now speaking seem to reverse this aim; they refuse even to attempt to make the State religious; but they object not to make the Church, or at least their own portion of it, political; and political in the lowest and worst sense of the word.

A layman of high professional character, and who is an eminent member of a dissenting congregation near the metropolis, voted at the late election in favour of a candidate of whose unprincipled and grossly dishonest conduct he had had the fullest proof. In conversation he justified this. "True," he said, "I would not have consented to his being made a trustee of any property, or a director of any charity, or, in short, to have had any confidence or

power reposed in him, *except this*; but I do think that as a member of parliament I might vote for him; for his chief business and object will be, to support the Whigs, whom I want kept in; and to exclude the Tories, whom I want kept out."

An eminent preacher among the Independents, in the west of England, thus justified a similar line of conduct: He said, "If you are going to take a journey, and have a choice between two coachmen, one of them a good man, but a bad driver; the other, a known infidel, but an excellent whip;—will you not, if you exercise common sense, choose the man who can best serve you in that thing; however you may disapprove his principles and practice in every other respect?"

It is one and the self-same error which runs through all these arguments. They are abstract, not practical. They do not take man as he is, but insist on assuming him to be what he is not. Thus their model of a king, as described by Dr. Pye Smith in his sermon on "*the Necessity of Religion to the well-being of a Nation*,"—appears to be a sovereign who is filled with piety and Christian zeal—in *his closet*,—but who, when he comes forth as a king, is to know nothing of the difference between a believer and an atheist; and to look with the same favour upon a Robert Owen or a William Wilberforce.

In the same irrational manner they see no reason why a very great villain should not make a very good member of parliament; and more, they see no reason why they themselves should not *prefer* the scoundrel to the honest man, if only the former promised to vote for a Whig ministry, while the latter preferred a Tory one!

And again, they assimilate the business of legislation, into which the highest moral and religious principles ought constantly to enter, to the mere driving of a coach; in which art it is plain that a man might attain to the highest degree of excellence, and yet be the greatest reprobate out of the infernal pit!

Now the whole of this is in the highest degree absurd, inasmuch as it refuses to deal with man as he is. A man's principles, be they bad or good, *must* influence his conduct, whether as ruler or legislator. He cannot "rule in the fear of God," if he scoffs at that fear. The interests of the nation cannot, consistently with common sense, be entrusted to one in whose hands you would not place the deeds of a chapel or a school-house. As to the miserable partizan plea, "He will vote for the ministers whom we desire to retain in office;"—that is nothing else than the old system of "doing evil that good may come," under the last new guise.

We are ready to admit that we should have felt neither pain nor surprise had many of the Dissenters, feeling a strong preference

for the Whigs, declined to vote in certain of the recent elections. Had they said, "We cannot bring ourselves to vote for a Tory, and we will not vote for such a man as in this place is opposed to the Tories," we believe that they would have commanded a degree of respect from both parties. Instead of which, by their recent conduct, they have filled many a Conservative with horror at their unscrupulous partizanship; while the very men whom they have supported, scoff at them as smooth-faced hypocrites, whose religion is a very convenient portion of their outward apparel!

If we cared more for party interests than for the growth of spiritual religion among our countrymen, we should rejoice at the course which a large proportion of the Dissenters have lately taken. It has acted, and continues to act, as a perpetual blight upon their congregations. Their missionary efforts decline; and instead of raising, as they did twenty years since, almost as many new chapels as members of the Establishment could build churches, they are not, now, erecting *one* new edifice where the Church erects *ten*.

But let this visible decay of dissent teach us a lesson. Nothing can have been clearer, in their case, than that a descent into the region of mere party politics, a coalescing with Papists, Socinians, and Infidels, merely to gain an end, has induced a decline in spiritual life among them; and that this decline in spiritual life has not only deteriorated their personal and interior standing, but has sensibly and visibly diminished their external power and influence. The very means which they adopted to elevate themselves, and to depress those whom they chose to consider as their adversaries, have had an entirely different effect. Those means have preyed upon their own internal strength, while the alarm they have created has roused churchmen to new and greater efforts.

Let, then, this example be a warning to churchmen. Let it shew them, that their only real strength and vigour is derived from a different and a higher source. The Church will flourish, simply and solely in proportion to the degree of spiritual and divine energy diffused among her members. Her only real strength and prosperity comes from above, and must be drawn down by faith and prayer. Without this, the wisest and most cunningly-devised schemes of man will only raise up a merely human institution, as little fitted to create anew the souls of men, or to build up "a temple of lively stones," as the Useless-Knowledge Society itself!

We desire, therefore, that churchmen should universally understand and feel, that the "one thing needful," the only indispensable and sufficient thing for the Church's prosperity, is *Divine influence*. If the Spirit of the living God be really going forth

throughout the Church, "turning men from darkness into light, and from the power of Satan unto God," then is the Church prospering. But if this be not so—or if it be so only in a less and less degree, day by day—then, although new churches may arise by hundreds, and statesmen begin once more to patronise and to caress,—our prospect is not satisfactory; it is rather the reverse; and weeping and fasting would better become us than pride, and exultation, and self-confidence. Let the eye and the heart of the Christian, then, who is anxious for his country and his Church, be uplifted to God, not for temporal or political ascendancy, but for an increase of the Spirit's energy, to multiply, an hundred-fold, those "lively stones," of which alone the spiritual temple can be composed.

Still, however, we are not to counsel sluggish inertness, or to represent that the Christian's duty, in our present circumstances, is simply to "stand still, and see the salvation of God." Clear and obvious duties are before him; and of these we are now, in the second place, to speak.

That a government professedly founded on Conservative principles is on the point of being formed, may, we apprehend, be attributed, under God's providence, chiefly to the efforts made by the members of the Church of England, during the last ten years, to enlarge that Church, and to increase its salutary influence among the people. Alarm has produced alacrity, and zeal has wrought a vast improvement; and thus the Church has greatly strengthened her hold on the public mind, and by her influence the people are daily becoming more and more disposed to "fear God and to honour the Queen," and to "meddle not with them that are given to change."

But, having now, apparently, worked out, by great care and labour, a result so important as the re-establishment of a Conservative government, it can hardly be expected that we should blindly commit ourselves into the hands of that government, dismissing all care and concern for the future. The mere change of one set of men for another is of little importance except we are to derive some clear and palpable benefits from the substitution.

We have already said that one particular matter—Church Extension—has been so far advanced as merely to wait for a vote of the House of Commons; which, constituted as that assembly now is, cannot, surely, be long withheld. Such a vote would render it an official duty, incumbent on the government, to propose a pecuniary grant, of such extent as might appear to the executive to be suited to the exigency. On this point, then, we trust that there cannot be any considerable delay.

But this, though an important and excellent beginning, will

constitute but a single one of various measures which are loudly called for, to render the Established Church in this country, really efficient. Let not the dissenters be alarmed;—it is not of money that we are now speaking; nor are we aware, that after a proper provision has been made for Church Extension,—any other demand, to any serious amount, need be made on the national finances. It is rather in the way of *regulation*, that fresh legislation is required. We will specify a few cases, in which such regulation is greatly needed.

In the first place we must speak of that great and crying need of the Church,—the want of a fresh subdivision of parishes. A noble instance of liberality in supplying this want was given, only last session, by Lord Stanley, who obtained an act to divide the great family living of Winwick, in Lancashire, in the patronage of the house of Derby,—into nine separate parishes, each with its own rector or vicar, its own Church, and its own parsonage! Now, highly desirable as such a reform was in that particular case, still more certain is it that in such parishes as Birmingham, Whalley, Manchester, Leeds, Marylebone, and Pancras, the necessity is infinitely greater. And if a nobleman, to whom the possession of a living of £2000 a year is always so desirable in a worldly point of view, as a “provision” for a younger son or son-in-law,—if an individual can make such a sacrifice,—how much more ready ought the state itself to be, to divide at once such enormous districts as Marylebone, Manchester, Pancras, and others; the patronage of which belongs, not to any individual, but to the public; in the person of the lord chancellor, the bishop, or the chapter. The very moment, then, that the point of Church Extension has been secured, the next step, of Parochial Subdivision, ought to follow.

A third, and a crying need of the Church, is, an enlargement of the means of Education for the Clergy. At present we are running into the inconsistency of erecting new churches, and increasing the services to be discharged in the old ones, without adopting any adequate means to facilitate that supply of additional ministers, which these measures will render absolutely necessary. Very naturally, therefore, does it follow, that an incumbent who is at all careful as to the character of the assistant he employs, may often wait for months, and almost years, under present circumstances, before he can meet with a man with whom he feels satisfied to share his pastoral charge.

Yet, at the very same moment there are numbers, among the lower ranks of the middle classes of society, who feel strongly inclined to enter the ministry, if the path were but open. It is not unfrequent to hear of such persons, under circumstances leading

to a strong conviction that the inclination is from above. The difficulty in the way of such is a pecuniary one. They would be content to toil hard, live poorly, and wear the most ordinary clothing, during the time of their necessary studies. But in most cases this humility of mind does not overcome the difficulty. To obtain ordination they must go to college: there they must remain for some three or four years; and in each year nearly £100 must be expended, even on the most economical plan, for their maintenance. This £300 or £400 places the ministerial office quite beyond the reach of many.

Yet we want the services of these men. We *very peculiarly want* the services of *this class* of men. From a deficiency in plain and homely preachers, taken from among the people, multitudes of our artizans and little shopkeepers give a preference to the more congenial style of preaching of the meeting-house. We desire not to acquire a *vulgar* class of preachers; but we do think that there is room for a large body of additional ministers in the Church, taken from among the working classes, and fitted to gain the ear of the working classes. This does not at all imply coarseness, or flippancy, and irreverent familiarity. Plain, everyday English, of the Saxon origin, with as few Latin or Greek words in it as possible; simple earnestness; clear and apt illustration, without any attempt at singularity,—these are the preaching features which require to be cultivated, if we would render our ten new churches at Bethnal Green, or our other ten at Birmingham, of any real utility.

We want, then, a new college, or even several. These should be built, and provided with the requisite professors, at the public cost; whether to be raised by private benevolence, or by parliamentary grants, we need not stop to argue. So raised, and so provided, what should hinder an humble man, intent on his great object, from bringing his expenses, during his college course, within £30 or £40 per annum? But such institutions as these should be provided solely for those whose object was to serve God in the ministry of his word. Our Universities sometimes tell us, now, that they do not aim at giving a *professional* education. We want, then, a college or two which *would* give a professional education,—which *would* train men singly and solely for the service of the Church.

We might proceed to name two or three other matters of vast importance; but probably we have said enough on these points for the present time. In what we have written our object has been to draw men's minds from party squabbles, to things of somewhat higher importance. We would not undervalue what we trust may prove a great deliverance; but we strongly feel, and desire earnestly

to impress on others, that the ultimate fate of Britain,—which all will admit to be still in suspense,—depends in a far greater degree on the improvement of the Church, and the increase of spiritual life among the people, than on any possible combination of parties, or any contrivances of merely human legislation.

DISCOURSES UPON THE POWERS OF THE CLERGY;
Prayers for the Dead; and the Lord's Supper. Preached at
 the Temple Church, by CHRISTOPHER BENSON, M.A., Master of
 the Temple. London: *Parker.* 1841.

LIKE all other persons engaged in the conduct of a periodical, we are perpetually reminded of the fable of the Old Man and his Ass. Scarcely a point of detail can be named, on which we do not receive the most opposite counsel; scarcely a step can we take without meeting with reproof and applause, and both offered, from different quarters, at the same moment of time. Some wish for "more copious extracts from the works reviewed;" others, "larger original discussions, with less of minute details of this or that particular book." Some thank us for pointing out errors in the conduct of a Religious Society; others, in a most extraordinary tone, almost treat us as criminals for having ventured to suggest a doubt of the said Society's infallibility! We would desire to avoid a self-sufficient and dogmatical spirit; but to one class of advisers we would respectfully remark, that we have *many differing tastes* to take into our account; while to the other we must observe, that if we were required to conduct this periodical on the condition of approving everything that is done by every "Religious" society in London, we would not issue another number!

It appears to us obviously desirable to deal with different topics and different authors in different ways. In the last article we discussed a *subject*;—in the present we intend to give an account of a *book*. And the book before us is one of such intrinsic value; it is written by one who so thoroughly understands, and so admirably expresses, what he means to say, that we entirely believe that the best and most satisfactory account we can give, will be by letting the author speak for himself.

Mr. Benson is one, and perhaps nearly at the head, of a class of divines, who are not, possibly, very numerous, but who are exceedingly valuable. Numerous, in fact, they can hardly be, for, unreasonable

as it may seem, we can scarcely help ranking *talent* among the characteristics of this class. Among its members we should reckon such men as the Bishop of Chester, Archdeacon Hare, and several of the most eminent of the Irish clergy ; who, without being in the line of " succession " to the Romaines and Newtons and Scotts of former days ; and without having sought or incurred, at least at their first entrance on the ministry, the distinction or the stigma conferred by the term " Evangelical," have yet, each for himself, read, and thought, and prayed, until the tone and character of his ministry, without being impressed by mortal hand, came to be that which fully and honestly agrees with the standard laid down by the Church of England in her thirty-nine articles. We earnestly desire that this " school " may increase ; and we do so because it has no human head or master. All history proves, and the annals of our own Church as clearly as any other,—that the tendency of all human systems, and schools, and parties, is to deteriorate. We look, therefore, with the greater anxiety for new effusions of divine influence ; for fresh uprisings of men who can say, with the apostle, though in a lower and restricted sense, "*I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.*"

The work now before us will form, with its predecessor, a seemly and most precious volume. The first publication of these " Temple Discourses,"—*On Tradition and Episcopacy*,—is already in its third edition, and will live at least as long, we will venture to say, as the errors which it is designed to correct shall continue to trouble the Church. The present continues the course, by prosecuting the inquiry into the validity of those high pretensions now advanced by some of the clergy of our Church,—to exercise what they term " the power of the keys," and to " possess the sole power of *making the body and blood of Christ.*"

In the first of Mr. Benson's present discourses, he considers the text, "*I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*" (Matt. xvi. 19.)

" By some," says Mr. B., " it is held that these words were spoken to St. Peter as the representative of the apostolic body, and so the type of the Christian ministry throughout all succeeding ages. It is consequently argued, that the episcopal clergy at large are to be regarded as heirs of the same promise and possessors of the same power of the keys.

" But why should we ascribe this representative character to the Apostle in the present case? In answer to this question we are referred to the peculiar position which St. Peter on so many occasions occupied, and to the remarkable manner in which he so frequently spoke and acted. But it does

not follow from this, that we are bound to attach any deeper meaning to every thing he said and did than we should at first sight conceive to belong to them. Still less does it authorise us to resolve that deeper meaning into his being at all times, and consequently also in the present instance, the exact type of Christ's legitimate ministers.

" For what is it that the Gospels tell us of Simon? Sometimes they record the superior strength, and at others the greater weakness of his faith. They speak sometimes of his being honoured, together with a few of his fellow-disciples; sometimes of his being honoured alone and above them all. They mention the severer reproof, as well as the higher commendations, which he received from his and our most gracious Lord. They relate how his zeal led him to promise far more of fidelity to his Divine Master, and also how his infirmity caused him to fall into a far more shameful denial of that Master, than the rest of his brethren. We read not only of the gracious declaration with which his confession of the divine sonship of Jesus was recompensed, but of the solemn prediction of his fall, called down by the presumption of his boasted firmness. They give to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, but they give to him also the appellation of Satan, and accuse him of a carnal mind.

" From a survey of all these particulars it is clear, that Peter was, on many occasions, the most prominent of the Apostles both in what was right and what was wrong. In a word, his character was marked by several peculiarities; a fact which, instead of constituting him the general representative of the rest of the Apostles, would seem more especially and personally to distinguish and separate him from them all, both by his excellences and defects.

" If the general tenor of St. Peter's conduct does not make it necessary to consider that in *every* address to him from our Lord we are to look on what was said to him as applicable also to every other minister of the Gospel, neither do the circumstances of this particular address give it a claim to be looked upon in that light.

" The circumstances were these. When our Lord came into the coasts of Cæsarea-Philippi, he asked his disciples this question, ' Whom do men say that I am? And *they* said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, others Jeremias, or one of the prophets.' The question here was addressed to them all. Upon this general reply our Lord proceeded to inquire into their own opinion, and said, ' But whom say ye that I am?' This question was as general as the other; but it produced a very different result. To this inquiry none gave answer save one. All allusion to the rest of the Apostles is now dropped by the Evangelist, and St. Peter alone is brought forward, as giving the reply, and saying, ' Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' This is all that he is represented to have said. Not one word is added which has a tendency to convey the idea that he spoke for others, or in their name, or even to imply that the rest of the Apostles had so much firmness or clearness of faith as to unite in the expression of the same creed. Yet upon other and less important occasions it is the habit of the Evangelists especially to notice this circumstance. So when Jesus said, Who touched me? When all denied, Peter said, and they that were with him said also, Master, the multitude throng thee and press thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?—Luke viii. 45. So again, when St. Peter vowed never to forsake his Master, we are told by this very same Evangelist, St. Matthew, that the other Apostles made a similar vow. ' Peter said to Jesus, Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee in any wise. Likewise also said all the disciples.'—Chap. xxvi. 35. But there is nothing of the kind added here. There is, on the contrary, a marked and sudden change in the form of the reply, from the plural, ' they said,' as applied to the Apostles in general, to the singular, ' he said,' as confined to St. Peter in particular. We are thus led naturally, and almost inevitably, to infer, that

the confession belonged exclusively to him, and are not authorized to include the other Apostles in the answer he made.

"In confirmation of this view, we find that the blessing with which our Lord rewarded the confession was as strictly confined to St. Peter as the confession itself. For Jesus answered and said, not, blessed are ye, but 'Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona.' This commendation is made pre-eminently personal, not only by being framed in a singular number, but by the special addition of his name and parentage. Simon, the son of Jona, is the person designated; and the exclusive application of the blessing to him is established by the reason so pointedly assigned for it, 'Blessed are thou . . . for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' If the same clear revelation of Christ's sonship had been made to all the Apostles—if all had received the revelation with the same assurance of faith, and made, through Peter, the same full acknowledgment of their creed—is it consistent with the usual kindness of our Lord, and his desire to render to every one his due praise, that, instead of including them all in his blessing, he should single out St. Peter alone? But more especially, is it not singular, if such were the case, that he should have singled him out in a manner so marked that every unprejudiced reader is, at first sight, led to consider him as the individual who, having exclusively proclaimed his faith, was exclusively commended for the openness of his declaration?

"But if this be so—if the faith and the commendation belonged to Peter alone—then must the gift of the keys, and the authority to bind and to loose, be subjected, so far as this passage is concerned, to an equally limited interpretation. For the promise of these things is inalienably attached to the blessing, and can be referred to none but him upon whom the blessing was pronounced. In a word, there is not in the narrative itself the smallest hint that Peter spake in the name of his brethren. On the contrary, there is much to lead to the conclusion that he spake only for himself, in his more abundant zeal, and that, out of the fulness of his own convictions, and the energy of his own native character, he uttered that which the rest of the Apostles wanted either conviction of mind or sufficient warmth of feeling to proclaim. As pre-eminent above his fellows in these qualities, Peter was, therefore, pre-eminently rewarded with praises and personal privileges from his Lord.

"This opinion will be strengthened as we proceed to examine what follows in the chapter. We there read that, immediately after the divine dignity of our Lord had been thus confessed by Peter and acknowledged by himself, he then turned once more to the disciples in general, and commanded them not to make his character as the Messiah known:—'*Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.*' This would not surely have been thus spoken had all that went before, and was addressed to Peter, been addressed to them all in his name. There would then have been no necessity for any change in the form of our Lord's language. It would have been enough, and have been more natural and proper, to have continued the discourse to Peter as the representative of his brethren, and to have commanded him, and consequently his brethren in him, not to tell others what he had confessed.

"The Evangelist goes on in the next verse to inform us, that Jesus now thought fit to prepare the Apostles' minds for his sufferings and death. '*From that time forth he began to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed and raised again the third day.*' And here the forwardness of Peter led him a second time to interpose his own opinion, and to state what he thought it became Jesus, as the Messiah, to do. So 'he took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall not happen unto thee. But Jesus turned and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of man.'

"Now, it is universally allowed that this second address of Peter, and this second reply of our Lord, belong personally and exclusively to St. Peter. But it is evident that, with the exception of the subject matter, they are framed upon the same model, and related in phraseology the same in kind, with that in which the account of his previous confession and blessing is conveyed; though it may, perhaps, be fairly argued that, in the former instance, the words 'Simon Barjona' make the application still more pointedly personal than the simple word 'Peter' in this. It follows, therefore, that both passages should be explained in the same way, and both regarded as belonging to St. Peter in his individual capacity and alone."—(pp. 5—11.)

"To bring this discussion to a close, we may observe that, if we extend the gift of the keys to all succeeding ministers of the Gospel, it will be difficult to ascertain the real nature of the promised privilege. According to some, it comprehends only the key of knowledge; others as strongly contend for its being understood of the key of authority. Upon the kind and degree of that authority, theologians are again divided; not knowing whether it is to be restricted to the privilege of administering those sacred ordinances through which we enter and abide in the Church, or to be extended to the power of excommunication, whereby, on earth, we lock the door of the kingdom of heaven against them that believe not, or walk disorderly in the Christian profession; or whether it be not, in fact, the same as the authority to bind and loose, and the power of remitting and retaining sins. But when the language of our Lord upon this occasion is confined to Peter, the predictive promises it contains admit of a ready interpretation, and are seen to have received a full accomplishment. For he it was who first opened the kingdom of heaven to all manner of believers. He it was, also, who prescribed to them the conditions upon which they might enter in.

"On the day of Pentecost, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit of Christ, did Peter lift up his voice unto the Jews, and bring three thousand of the circumcised disciples of Moses into the Church of the Redeemer, binding upon them the additional burthen of baptism in the name of Jesus, for the remission of sins. Through Peter also, and by a special revelation from God, was the door of salvation unlocked to the Gentiles, and without binding upon them the law of circumcision. For he commanded Cornelius, the first heathen convert, only to be baptized in the name of the Lord. There seems, however, at a later period, to have been some difference of opinion as to the propriety of turning this single example into a general rule, and many still doubted whether, in ordinary cases, those who had not been circumcised after the manner of Moses could be deemed partakers of the full benefits of the Gospel. Therefore, 'the Apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up,' and relieved the heathen converts from that observance of the Mosaic law which circumcision entailed, and under which some still wished to keep the believers in Jesus bound. He declared, that, to put that yoke upon the neck of Christ's disciples, was to tempt God: and the decision which he had thus peremptorily made, being adopted and confirmed by James, the latter, as the president of the assembly, proposed a decree in entire conformity with Peter's views. That decree was also bound in heaven by the Holy Ghost; for the Apostles and elders proclaimed that it had seemed good to the Holy Ghost, as well as to themselves, to lay upon their Christian brethren no greater burthen than absolute necessity required. So was St. Peter intrusted with the keys both of the Jewish and Gentile Church; and so, in a manner which belongs to no other Apostle or minister of Christ, did he bind the ordinance of baptism, and the obligations it entails, upon those Israelites who turned to the Lord, whilst he loosed the rite of circumcision and its attendant consequences from every other race.

"When we thus compare the figurative language of our Saviour with the events of Peter's life, we perceive at once that the prophecy had a satisfactory accomplishment, and feel persuaded that those Christian writers,

whether of ancient or modern times, who have considered it as specially applicable to him, have taken the clearest view, and given the most probable interpretation of the text. For there is no novelty in the explanation here produced. It was, so far as we can learn, the earliest mode of interpretation in the Church. At least, it is that which is adopted by two of the earliest of the Fathers who have referred to the passage, I mean by Irenæus and Tertullian, in the second century, and by Origen and Cyprian in the third. It was not until a later period that Ambrose and Jerome gave a greater degree of authority to the supposition that the privileges conferred upon Peter were conferred on him as the general representative of his brethren."—(pp. 14—17.)

There remains only the other passage, of an apparently similar tenor, in which our Lord says, *to his disciples at large*, "*Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.*"

"What are the nature and purport of those words as they are used in that place? Look to the context. In a discourse to his disciples, which refers to various subjects, our Lord is led to point out the loving-kindness of God the Father and of Himself, in bringing back sinners from the error of their ways. As a man that hath an hundred sheep seeketh that which is gone astray, so, he says, does our Father which is in heaven desire that not any of his little ones should perish; and so is the Son come upon earth to seek and to save that which was lost. From this kindness of the Father and the Son towards moral and religious transgressors, our Saviour takes occasion to point out the forbearance which Christians, as the children of the Father and the Son, should observe towards such of their brethren as violate their duty to their neighbour. They are not at once to renounce the society of the offenders, or prosecute them with the severities of law, until they have tried by several methods to bring them to a better mind. 'And,' in like manner, he proceeds, 'If thy brother offend against thee,' as God's children do against his laws, 'go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother;' gained him from his sin, and gained him for a friend, instead of hardening him into bitterness and obstinacy, by pursuing him as an enemy. 'But if he will not hear, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them,' if he refuse to obey their exhortations and follow their judgment, 'tell it to the Church,' to the Christian congregation to which you belong, or to the authorities settled therein for the determination of such points. 'And if he neglect to hear the Church,' if he decline to be bound by the decision so made, 'let him be unto thee as a heathen man, and a publican.' In other words, let him no more be treated with that peculiar degree of forbearance which is due from one member of the Christian household to every other, so long as there is a reasonable prospect of bringing him to an acknowledgment and amendment of his iniquity; but let him be looked upon and dealt with, as in a similar case you would look upon and deal with those in whom there are no common religious hopes and principles to bind you together by the near and sacred ties of spiritual affections and interests. Then follows immediately the passage to which reference is made,—'Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.'

"It is evident that this declaration is most strictly connected with the preceding directions, and made to the same individuals. It is in fact a solemn assurance that whatever decision shall be made by the persons, in the

cases and under the circumstances mentioned by our Lord in his previous discourse, will be sanctioned by God. But the cases referred to are cases of civil injury between Christian brethren,—the circumstances spoken of are those in which every effort is made to obtain a private reparation of the injury,—and the parties concerned are, the person injured, the two or three referees, and the whole body of the Church acting by itself, or by its appointed officers. The promise, therefore, must, in consistency with all the ordinary rules of interpretation, be limited on the present occasion to the trespasses of one believer of the Gospel against another, and be applied to some one, or more properly, perhaps, to all the parties I have named."—(pp. 18—20.)

Finally :—

"What we conclude from the two passages we have reviewed is this:—In the former the gift of the keys to open the kingdom of heaven, and authority to bind and to loose whatsoever laws he, being guided by the influence of the Holy Spirit, should think fit to abolish or impose, were expressly conferred upon Peter, and, as it would appear, upon him personally and alone. From what is afterwards related to us of Peter's conduct and life, we are also enabled to understand what was meant by the gift and authority conveyed to him by our Lord. In the second passage, the keys are altogether omitted, and the power to bind and to loose seems limited by the context to cases of trespass between one Christian and another; and in that limited sense the power may be supposed to be given either to the injured individual, or to those two or three together with him whom he may select as witnesses and referees; or to the Church at large, as the tribunal of final appeal; or to all. In neither place is there any satisfactory proof that the Apostles, and their successors, the bishops and priests of the Church, are the exclusive depositaries of these privileges and powers. It is not safe or just, therefore, to rest upon these texts the claims of the episcopal clergy to an authority to admit and to exclude those who seek an entrance through the Church into God's everlasting kingdom, or the still greater authority of absolving or refusing to absolve the sins of such baptized believers as may appear to them to possess or to want the necessary qualification of a true repentance. Some evidence more clear, some proof more convincing, must be alleged, before these or any similar privileges can, upon the authority of Scripture, and independent of all human appointment, be either attributed to the ministers of religion by others, or assumed by the humble servants of Christ for themselves.—(pp. 22, 23.)

In the second discourse, Mr. Benson proceeds to another division of the same subject,—*the power of absolution or remitting sins*. He discusses the text on which this assumed power is usually rested, "*Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.*" (John xx. 21—23.) The question, here, obviously is, whether this commission, and this extraordinary power, were conferred upon the Apostles, then present, solely; or whether they were addressed in the name of, and as representing, the appointed ministers of the gospel, to the end of the world? On this point Mr. Benson says :—

"First of all, it will be expedient to look narrowly into the construction of the passage itself. Thereby we shall see whether there be any peculiarities in the form and order of our Saviour's expressions upon the present occasion, which, when compared with his manner of speaking to the Apostles upon similar subjects and at other times, may enable us to decide, whether he here intended to confer a general and permanent commission on all his ministers, or meant to give only a special and peculiar privilege to the Apostles themselves.

"Now, it is obvious, that there is a marked difference between the form of the declaration at present under review, and the three last verses of St. Matthew's Gospel, in which, at a later period, our Lord gave a perpetual and universal command to baptize and teach, together with a promise to be always with his ministers in their work. In considering the structure of that passage, it is to be observed, that the promise of aid follows the command to preach. Go, baptize, and teach, 'and,' that is, in your so doing, 'I will be with you always.' Thus, it is *there* implied, that the presence of Christ so promised, is dependent and consequent upon a due obedience to the command. An order the very reverse of this is introduced into the address which now engages our thoughts. *Here* there is, in the first place, an absolute communication of God's Spirit to be a guide to the apostles in their work; and then, after they have been so qualified, the nature of the work itself is pointed out. Thus it is intimated, that the gift of Divine inspiration was that which would entitle them to be intrusted with, and enable them to exercise properly the power conferred; instead of their endeavour faithfully to perform the duty enjoined entitling them to that Divine assistance through which they would become able to fulfil it. In the one case our Lord speaketh on this wise:—All power is given unto me. Therefore, give I unto you the command and the authority to go and teach all nations; and if ye teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, then, and upon that condition, will I also be with you and assist you, always, with the fulness of that power which I have received. But in the case which we are now considering, he speaks to the following effect:—As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. My Father hath sent me full of the Holy Ghost, to teach, to suffer for, to redeem, to sanctify, and to forgive the sins of the world. Now, it is for the last of these my manifold offices, that is, for the forgiveness of sins, that I at this time give to you a special commission. And in order that ye may be duly qualified to administer this high authority according to the Divine will, receive ye the Holy Ghost. I communicate to you that spirit of wisdom, that inspired knowledge of man's heart, and God's counsels, which is necessary for the proper exercise of the power I am about to bestow upon you. Know, therefore, that, being thus qualified for your task, 'Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.' In other words:—My Father has sent me with the fulness of the Spirit and power on earth to forgive sins. In like manner, and for the like end, I now send you. Take, therefore, such a measure of the same Spirit and power as may enable you also, when circumstances require it, to do as I have done, and, in your sphere and degree, to remit or retain the transgressions of individuals in the Christian Church.

"Such is the interpretation which seems naturally to arise out of these words. If this interpretation be correct, it follows that none ought to claim the remission or retention of sins as a privilege belonging to themselves, unless they are fully convinced, and can also convince others, that they possess that inspiration of the Holy Ghost which alone can make them capable of using this great authority in such exact conformity to God's will as to be sure of their forgiveness on earth being accompanied by forgiveness in heaven. They, in fact, who assume that they have a key to lock or unlock the door of entrance into God's favour when it has been barred by sin, must give full assurance to all who are concerned, that they possess sufficient strength and knowledge rightly and effectually to apply the key. But such

an assurance may spring most satisfactorily, perhaps can spring only, from that source to which our blessed Saviour appealed, when he was reprov'd for taking to himself, as man, that prerogative of pardon which originally belongs to, and can ultimately be confirmed only by God. 'Jesus said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee. And behold, certain of the Scribes said within themselves, This man blasphemeth. And Jesus knowing their thoughts, said That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house. And he arose, and departed to his house.' (Matt. ix. 2—7.) So did the mighty arm of the Father testify by this fulfilment of Christ's words in one case, that his words would equally be fulfilled by the almighty mercifulness of his Father in the other. The same testimony,—the testimony of a miracle,—should also be afforded by all who assert that they have the gift of the Holy Ghost to administer the forgiveness, or inflict the punishment, of sins upon any individual. Now, as this power of working miracles cannot, upon any just or sufficient grounds, be arrogated to itself by any branch of the Christian Church in the present day, there is no Church which can attribute, in its highest sense, the apostolical privilege of forgiving sins to its ministers, nor any ministers who can regard it as their own. Their claims, if any, which are founded on this text, must be to a power of forgiveness of a far more limited and ordinary kind than that which was so absolutely conferred in it, upon the apostles, by our Lord.

"But whatever be the sense in which the passage is to be understood, it may be fairly doubted whether it was intended to apply to any but the Apostles themselves. For a second observation which may be made upon it is this—that there is not a single word to express or to intimate that the Saviour of the world had in his view any individuals of a later period, or lower rank in the Church, than those whom he immediately addressed. In this point it will be found to differ materially from his last and general and most comprehensive commission to the Apostles. Then, as if studiously endeavouring to signify that he was looking on the disciples before him as the representatives of all future teachers, he concluded by making the following declaration—'And Lo I am with you always, *even unto the end of the world.*' Such words attributed to them a perpetuity commensurate with the world's duration, and which, as it belonged not to their persons, we can rationally explain only by referring it to their successors. Such was the mode in which he framed his injunction to them to baptize and teach all nations. But, in communicating the power to forgive sins, there occurs no hint of the perpetuity of that power, and no allusion to the gift of the Holy Ghost being continued to the end of the world, in such a manner and degree as to qualify men for its due and right exercise. The reasonable conclusion, therefore, and that which alone any impartial reader, upon a just comparison of the two passages, would draw, would be this—that, as the two addresses were delivered upon different occasions, and vary so remarkably in their construction and phraseology, they were intended to be different also, both in their meaning and application; and that, whilst one was carefully marked out as having an abiding operation throughout all ages in the Church, the other was designed to end with the individuals to whom it was originally declared. It is indeed remarkable that those who maintain, and profess to prove from the consideration of this text, that the power to forgive and to retain sins is vested in the ministers of the visible Church for ever, seem to have been aware of this objection to their view. Therefore, in order to overcome the difficulty, they have gone to the Gospel of St. Matthew, and forcibly separating Christ's promise to be always, and even unto the end of the world, with those who baptize and teach according to his commandment, from the passage to which alone it legitimately belongs, have transferred it to the Gospel of St. John, and to our Lord's communication of the Holy Ghost to his Apostles for the forgiveness and retention of sins. Some have done this,

without even stating that the power of remitting sins, and the promise to be with them to the end of the world, were conveyed to the Apostles in different discourses and at different times. Others have only united the promise with the power, after having laid it down that, according to their opinion, the authority to absolve sinners means no more than an authority to baptize and teach the Gospel. But in both cases it is evident, that the rules of sound interpretation are violated, and that nothing but the plainest proofs of the identity of the two commissions can justify our applying to the one what is only affirmed of the other. It must first be shown, by a course of independent and incontrovertible reasoning, that to remit and to retain sins means no more than to administer baptism, whereby they are by God, and upon the conditions of faith and repentance, remitted or retained; and it is not until that identity has been effectually established, that we can deal with the two passages as equivalent to each other."—(pp. 26—32.)

Next, Mr. Benson proceeds to enquire, what was the real nature and extent of the privilege they received; and in what manner it may be demonstrated that it was in their possession:—

"The power, as it was verbally communicated to the Apostles, was, in nature though not in degree, the same with that which was entrusted to the Son himself, a power *on earth* to forgive sins. This power, as it was exercised by Christ as the Son of man, was not merely an authority to preach the doctrine of mercy to repentance and faith in the Gospel, and to proclaim that whosoever was converted and believed would be justified from his offences. It was likewise an authority to pronounce to individual sinners that their iniquities were pardoned, which implied, of course, a divine knowledge that such individuals were proper objects of God's pardoning grace, and was frequently accompanied and confirmed by some sign or wonder as a sufficient testimony that he spake according to the divine will, and that his sentence had the seal of heaven to its truth and efficacy. In this manner, as we have already observed, he acted towards the sick of the palsy—'Thy sins be forgiven thee,' was the form in which he granted pardon—'Take up thy bed and walk,' and being obeyed at his bidding, was the miracle by which he manifested that he had power on earth to pardon. It is for the exercise of a similar authority, and for similar evidence of its being actually possessed by the chosen disciples of Christ, that we must look to the genuine records which remain to us of their lives, in order to know whether their Lord's promise that they, through the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, should remit and retain the sins of particular individuals, was adequately fulfilled or no. These records consist of the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles, as they have been handed down to us in the New Testament; and almost the very first page that we open in them presents us with a case which amounts to a satisfactory proof of the point under consideration.

"For we are informed in the fifth chapter of the Acts, that a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession. But he kept back part of the price, his wife also being privy to it, and brought only a certain part for distribution among the poor. Taking credit for a liberality which they did not possess, they made an offering of a portion to the Church as if it had been the whole. So did they agree together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord. 'But Peter said, Ananias, why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men only, but unto God. And Ananias, hearing these words, fell down and gave up the ghost.' Thus did St. Peter unequivocally show, that to himself as an Apostle had been fulfilled Christ's promise of the communication of the Holy Ghost, and that by the Spirit's influence he was now enabled so to discover the secrets of men's hearts, and so to appreciate their wickedness and understand the extent of their guilt, as to form a correct judgment whether they were deserving of divine pardon or punishment. Nor did he long hesitate to give as clear a

demonstration of his own possession of that power to retain sins on earth, which his Saviour had joined to the promise of the Holy Ghost. For 'it was about the space of three hours after, when Sapphira, not knowing what was done, came in. And Peter answered unto her, Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much? And she said, Yea, for so much. Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? Behold! the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door and shall carry thee out.' He first convicted her of sin, and then retained it by passing the sentence of death upon her, as the penalty of her transgression. To declare the Apostle's power to act thus, and to exhibit to all following ages the true meaning of the authority committed to those chosen disciples by their risen Lord, it pleased that now ascended Lord to confirm the sentence by an immediate and miraculous execution. For, as when our Saviour claimed to himself the prerogative of forgiving sin, the sick of the palsy took up his bed and walked, so now, when Peter took upon himself the office of condemning sin, Sapphira 'fell down straightway at his feet, and the young men came in and found her dead, and carrying her out, buried her by her husband.' "(pp. 33—36.)

So also did St. Paul

"place himself on a level with the rest of those chosen followers of Christ, and the word of divine inspiration has been most careful to confirm our belief, by relating to us (Acts xiii. 7, &c.) one memorable example of God's approbation of his claims. Sergius Paulus, who, as we are told, was the governor of Cyprus, 'called for Barnabas and Saul and desired to hear the word of God. But Elymas the sorcerer withstood them, desiring to turn away the deputy from the faith. Then Saul (who is also called Paul) filled with the Holy Ghost,' according to Christ's promise to his Apostles, and being thus enabled to discover the thoughts and intents of his heart, 'set his eyes on him,' and addressed him in language which nothing but a divine insight into the mind of man could have justified. He said, 'O full of all subtlety and mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now behold the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season.' So did he spiritually discern the spiritual iniquities of Elymas, and being thus qualified to assume the just severity of a judge, he did retain his sins. And they were retained in the very manner and degree according to which he had declared that they should be punished. For 'immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness; and he went about, seeking some to lead him by the hand.' "(pp. 38, 39.)

Thus the promise and its fulfilment precisely agree; and,

"It is most clear, from these various examples, that the interpretation we have already given of our Lord's address to his Apostles is not only critically but historically true. The narratives of their acts, brief as they are, very plainly indicate that they did receive from Christ, and exercise upon several occasions, the two gifts we have named. They had, in the first place, such a measure of the Holy Ghost as enabled them to know the secret doings and dispositions of those men upon whose sins they were to judge, and to perceive whether they deserved to be remitted or retained. They were endued, secondly, with authority to remit or retain such sins according to the judgment they had formed, and the remission or retention they pronounced was immediately sanctioned by a sign and wonder from heaven.

"Such were the privileges conferred upon the Apostles themselves, and by those privileges we perceive that the words of our blessed Redeemer in this passage were literally fulfilled. But we look in vain for the same literal

fulfilment in the communication of the same gifts and power to their successors in this later age.

“ Until these powers are generally and openly restored—until the clergy can say that they know the hidden workings and inward motives of their brethren—and until they can give some divine testimony to show that they are entitled to take away, or to retain the guilt of individuals, we rob them of no honour which really belongs to them, when we infer that the words of Christ to his Apostles were never intended to convey the same authority to the whole body of his ministers. In their primary and proper sense, these words are quite inapplicable to the Christian priesthood at large, and it is only, therefore, in a very secondary and inadequate and unnatural sense, that they either can be, or have been generally, so applied; whilst upon the nature of that sense opinions the most various, and views the most obscure and indefinite, have been put forth. But what right have we to force our Lord's language into a meaning foreign to its apparent, or short of its legitimate, interpretation? Upon what ground is it that we suppose that the alleged accommodation was contemplated by him when he spoke? Assuredly we have much more reason to conclude, that the absence, in the 20th chapter of St. John, of that promise to be with the Apostles even unto the end of the world, which appears in the 28th chapter of St. Matthew, and forms so conspicuous a feature in the final commission they received, was a difference designedly made by our Lord between the two commissions, in order to signify that the latter was to be looked upon as an universal promise to the Christian ministry, the former as a privilege confined to Christ's first and favoured disciples alone.”—(pp. 39—41.)

From the infallible instruction of scripture, Mr. Benson passes on to the authoritative teaching of the Church, which he examines with care, coming to the conclusion, “ that a power to remit and retain the sins of whomsoever they will, neither is, nor is supposed by our Church to be, conveyed to her ministers at their ordination.”

The next discourse is on one of what St. Paul calls, “ the doctrines of men.” It is on Col. ii. 18. It discusses the question of the lawfulness and expediency of “ Prayers for the Dead.” It is, in our opinion, the ablest discourse of the four. Its language is in the author's best style, clear, nervous, convincing; fervent, without passion; devout, without mysticism. Can anything be more lucid or more honest than the opening statement of the question?

“ That daily care for the welfare of the churches of Christ which so heavily weighed upon the mind of St. Paul may be divided into two principal branches. The first consisted in a desire that they might know such doctrines as had been distinctly revealed, and obey such commandments of sobriety, righteousness, and godliness, as were indispensable to the formation of the Christian character. The second arose out of his anxiety that they might be preserved from mingling up with the essential principles of the Gospel any additional and unnecessary opinions, and that, with regard to the ordinances of piety, they might be guarded from any interference with the easiness of Christ's ceremonial yoke, by adopting forms or objects of worship which were the unauthorised inventions of men. The unprofitable distinction of meats; the superstitious observance of days and seasons; the now unavailing rite of circumcision and its unavoidable consequence, the duty of keeping the peculiar ordinances and statutes of the Mosaic law; the worshipping of angels; fables and genealogies;—all these weak and beggarly elements were pressed, by some, upon the faith or practice of the believers in

Jesus, as if they were the marks, or the privileges, or the duties of their profession. But against all such methods of overloading the simplicity of the gospel system, St. Paul strongly protested. He condemned them as the baseless fabrics of a false philosophy; as taught after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and as not built upon the wholesome foundation of any special words or general principles of the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ. He points out, in the text, the plausibility of those reasonings by which they were defended. He admits that many of the points insisted upon have a show of wisdom, in will-worship, and in appeals to our humility, and in the refined distinctions of science. But then it is a science falsely so called; a voluntary humility not imposed upon us by the teaching or conduct of our Lord; a mode of worship not exemplified by those whom the Holy Spirit had led into the whole truth of the Messiah's dispensation. Having traced these doctrines and practices to the perverseness of the fleshly mind, he goes on to censure them still further, as arising out of a presumptuous intrusion into things not seen, a weak preference of the authority of the members to that of the head; an abject submission to the traditions of men, unsupported by any ascertained commandment from the Lord.

The apostolical is not the only age in which evils like these have prevailed. Appealing to that sense of unworthiness which every human being must feel when he lifts up the voice of prayer or of praise to the Almighty, the Roman Church has directed and encouraged its votaries to practise the "voluntary humility" of approaching the throne of the Most High through the intercession of angels or of saints, and taught them, while trembling under a conviction of the perfect holiness of the Lord himself, to seek a refuge from despair in the tenderness of the Virgin Mother of that Lord. In like manner has it "intruded into things not seen," and assumed, without any Scriptural warrant, that there is a fire of purification through which all imperfect Christians who die must pass, and linger there in proportion to the number and magnitude of their transgressions. Upon this unauthorised doctrine that erring church builds a duty as unauthorised. It asserts that, by their supplications, and by various other means, living believers can mitigate or shorten the deserved sufferings of the dead, and hence it makes a call upon the Christian sympathies of all its followers to lessen the penal misery of their departed friends, by the masses they pay for, or the works of charity and piety they perform."—(pp. 59—61.)

After noticing the careful avoidance of these erroneous practices by the Church of England, Mr. Benson proceeds to state, with the greatest fairness, the position taken by the Oxford Tractarians of the present day :—

"There are those who, instead of rejoicing at this determination of the English Reformers, to utter nothing in the public worship of the Lord which is not sanctioned by some plain principle or precept of the divine word, have rather condemned or mourned over such a strict adherence to the written revelation of Christ, and pleaded for, at least, a private use and modified form of supplication for the dead. They give up the pains of purgatory as untenable; confess that the relief of departed believers from the penalties still due to their unforgiven transgressions, which the Romanists suppose to be procured by the repeated and religious services of the members or ministers of the church, is the vain invention of a corrupt and later age. But the propriety and efficacy of intercessory prayers for God's departed saints, are what they would still maintain. For they hold that those who die in the Lord, although justified from the guilt and punishment of their offences by the power of Christ's cross, are yet placed, for a time, only in an inferior and imperfect state of bliss. The imperfection of that bliss they believe will last until the day of final judgment, when every Christian will have his portion

of joy and glory unalterably and eternally settled for him by his Lord. In the mean time, however, they imagine that the limited degree of happiness possessed by each departed saint, is capable of some increase, according to the good pleasure of the Almighty. They, therefore, hold that the happiness of departed saints is not fixed, before the general resurrection, by any divine decree ; and thence conclude that its improvement becomes a legitimate object for the prayers of a righteous man ; that his prayers for its increase will be acceptable to God, and, like every other lawful and acceptable prayer, will obtain the thing for which it devoutly asks, in such a manner and degree as may be consistent with the will and purposes of Him who ruleth over all."—(pp. 62, 63.)

Admitting that this conclusion is fairly drawn from the premises, the question is, "how far these premises are capable of being defended on the ground of reason, scripture, and antiquity ?"

"Now that there is some imperfection in the felicity of the departed saints must be admitted by all who believe that the happiness promised to Christians is happiness both of body and of soul, and will consequently remain incomplete until the re-union of the two has been effected by the general resurrection of the dead. But what is there to show that this imperfection in the enjoyments of departed believers in the intermediate state is one which we are enabled in any measure to remedy by our prayers? Are there any solid arguments by which such a doctrine may be shown to be consistent with the principles of the Gospel, or be established by the just interpretation of any Scriptural text, or be traced to the practice or to any injunction of the Apostles? If we examine the matter diligently, I think that we shall be compelled to answer, No. And when once that negative answer has been fairly obtained, not all the anxiety of our hearts to hope that it is advantageous to the dead to offer up our supplications for an addition to the present happiness of their souls, should be permitted to bias our minds in favour of the lawfulness of the practice. For the offering up of such prayers then falls into the number of those acts of will-worship, which are founded upon an intrusion into things not seen, and into the performance of which, the words of the Apostle, in the text, most strictly forbid us to be beguiled."—(pp. 63, 64.)

An appeal, however, is often made to our natural feelings and affections ; it is urged that to pray for those who are taken from us "is an instinctive propensity of the human affections ; a matter of religious consolation ; a solemn privilege to the mourner ; an act which from its very nature is connected with the feelings of sacred sorrow. We are asked, whether this dictate of human nature, which is assumed to be warranted by the early Church, may not, after all, be implanted by the God of nature—may not be the voice of God within us? It is added, that to deprive the children of the English Church of such a source of comfort, and teach them that it is to be found only in the communion of Rome, is to place them in a needlessly disadvantageous position ; as it is probably conceived that, under such circumstances, they would be led to turn back to the impurities of Popery, rather than be deprived of the indulgence of this natural instinct, and the privilege of giving utterance to the voice of God within their souls." To this appeal Mr. Benson thus replies :—

"Admit for a moment the propriety of this appeal to what are declared to be just and holy suggestions of our nature; and then see to what consequences we shall be led, and how our religious service will, by following our feelings and affections as our guides, be moulded almost insensibly into the Roman form. Of the manifold causes of grief we experience for the loss of those we love, one of the most powerful and most godly is the fear that those who have long neglected the things of their everlasting peace, and not given the most clear and unequivocal testimonies of a deep and true repentance in the latter years or hours of their life, may possibly have died without the full forgiveness of their sins. Must not then, under such distressing circumstances, the work of supplication for the termination or diminution of the penal sufferings of our friends, have as much hold upon the sympathies of our heart, as a petition for the rest, and peace, and advancement to a higher state of bliss, of those whom we believe to be redeemed, could ever afford? To offer a prayer for the deliverance of an unpardoned sinner from the wretchedness of his everlasting state, cannot be less the dictate of human nature, or less a matter of sacred consolation, or a less solemn privilege to the mourner, or an act of less piety and charity, than asking for the promotion of even the lowest saint to some superior place of glory in the intermediate state. Hence if, as it is suggested, the instinctive tendencies of the heart are, upon such points, to be regarded as the voice of God, and the propensity thus to indulge our affections, to be looked upon as argument that they may be lawfully so indulged, the children of the Church of England are placed in a needlessly disadvantageous position, by being deprived of the liberty of offering up their devotions for the sinful dead. Nay, more, this source of consolation to the mourner, this privilege of praying for the relief of their departed friends, when fearful, or persuaded, of their condemnation to penal misery, is enjoined exclusively, or is, at least, to be found pre-eminently, in the communion of the Church of Rome. The prohibition, therefore, of this practice by our own formularies must strongly tempt those, who desire and approve this custom of praying for dead sinners, to return to the communion of that erring and superstitious Church again, in order that they may enjoy a consolation so natural and just."—(pp. 65—67.)

The main and turning-point of the controversy, however, is, What saith the scripture?—

"A Christian by his very name acknowledges that Christ alone has brought life and immortality to light, so that whatever He has not himself revealed, or has not been communicated to us through some channel which can be traced up to the inspired teaching of his Apostles, is not to be believed by us, or made the foundation of our religious services with reference to this world or to the world to come. Let us proceed then to inquire, whether there be any authority to be found either in the practice, or precepts, or doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, to establish the lawfulness, or assure us of the profitableness, of our devout supplications for the rest and peace of departed and justified Christians.

"The Scriptures are the source to which we are led, in the first instance, to apply for information. But we may search the New Testament in vain for either an example or a commandment to enforce the necessity or propriety of asking anything for those who have departed this life in God's true faith and fear. There are many exhortations to prayer contained in God's word, and important subjects are pointed out in great variety for the employment of our devotional hours. Supplications and thanksgivings for all sorts and conditions of men are enjoined. The old and the young; those that rejoice, and those that mourn; those that rule and those that obey: unbelievers and Christians; the evil and the good; all these, and many other divisions of human society, are in their turn recommended to our pious attention; but it is always with a reference to the condition of those who still dwell on earth,

not of those whose bodies already sleep in its dust. We are taught to petition for the wicked, that they may be converted, and for the righteous, that they may abound yet more and more in all faith, and love, and godliness, whilst they are in this present world: but neither for the wicked that they may be pardoned, nor for the righteous that they may grow more and more in happiness, when they have been taken away. A gradual advancement of the living towards perfection in grace is a frequent theme in the Apostolic requests unto the Lord; but we find not one passage in which they ever distinctly ask for a gradual advancement of the departed towards a perfection in glory. Peace and love from God the Father, and from his Son Jesus Christ, is the opening or the closing desire of several Epistles to the existing members of the different Churches; but peace and rest is never what they wish to be given to, whilst, on the contrary, they often describe it as enjoyed by, those who have put off their fleshly tabernacle. Is it possible, however, that such a prayer or wish should have been absent from the pages of the New Testament, if either required or even permitted to appear in the Christian's services of piety? Would a duty so sacred, if commanded, have been violated by the Apostles, or so consolatory a privilege have been neglected by them if allowed? Would those whose whole existence was spent in labours for the highest welfare of their brethren have confined themselves exclusively to works of piety and charity for the salvation of those around them? Would they not, had they but imagined it possible for such prayers to be useful or right, have been equally zealous in pouring forth the words of piety and charity for those whom the law of mortality had removed from their eyes? The Apostles had a love for their friends, and even their enemies, more fervent than we can venture to claim; and had they thought that, by their prayers, they could benefit the dead, with even half the measure of good their instructions bestowed upon the living, they would both by their example and teaching have made the offering of such prayers a matter of duty to the Churches which they superintended, and so have left a clear and imperishable record of their sentiments for the direction and encouragement of all succeeding times.'—(pp. 68—71.)

The apostles, however, have done no such thing, although occasions were continually occurring. Mr. Benson instances, the death of Stephen; the martyrdom of James; and the case of the Thessalonians, (1 Thess. iv.) as cases in which prayers for the departed *must* assuredly have been spoken of, if the apostles had viewed them as either desirable or even allowable. And the conclusion he draws, is, "that prayers for the dead being undiscoverable in the New Testament, is a fact which, under the circumstances of the case, affords a sufficient testimony to all, who rightly interpret the silence, as well as the declarations of God's word, that such prayers are neither the duty nor the privilege of the believers in Jesus." Next, Mr. Benson examines the language of scripture, as to the state of the departed; and finds, that "the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body," is what the saints in Paradise are expecting:—

"But we are sure that this reunion of body and soul, to taste together and in all their fulness of the gracious enjoyments of heaven, will be given to no one saint before another, nor to any, however earnestly we may desire or ask it, before that appointed hour in which all who are in the grave shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and come forth to receive, everlastingly and unchangeably, their bodily as well as spiritual reward. In a word, the resur-

rection of the flesh is what is still wanting to render the present blessedness of the departed complete, and the Gospel holds forth no prospect that by any prayers of ours we can deliver the bodies of any of the dead from the bondage of corruption before the period which is appointed for the resurrection of all. For the coming of that day we may safely ask; but the practice of petitioning for an increase of happiness, in their intermediate state, to those who have died in the faith and fear of the Lord, appears to be as incapable of being deduced from the principles, as of being supported by the precepts and examples of God's word."—(pp. 79, 80.)

The formularies and homilies of the Church are next examined, and lastly we have a masterly sketch of the judgment of "antiquity;" in neither of which can Mr. Benson find any valid justification of the practice. The whole question is summed up in this eloquent and judicious passage:—

"I beseech you, then, brethren, that ye be not beguiled into any acts of will-worship for departed believers, whether with a view to the indulgence of your own feelings, or the hope of increasing or securing their bliss and peace. Such thoughts are discountenanced by Scripture; discouraged by our Church in her Liturgy; and prohibited in her Homilies; nor can they plead the general voice of antiquity in favour of their Apostolical origin and use. They have not one, therefore, of the various supports upon which religious doctrines and practices are made, by different classes of Christians, to rest. Prayer for the dead is the mere imagination of divines intruding into things which man has not seen and God has not revealed, and then proceeding to draw such practical consequences as they conceive must naturally follow from what they have conjectured to be true. There is neither piety, nor wisdom, nor safety, in such a course. Secret things belong unto the Lord our God, and not to us; and in us it cannot be an act of reverential piety to endeavour to pry into the depths which he has reserved unto himself as his own peculiar province. For we may be sure that, in his infinite goodness, he hides from us only those matters which it would make us neither better nor happier on earth to know. The matters, therefore, which it is thus his glory to conceal, we never can suppose that we conduce to his glory, or manifest our own wisdom, by seeking with a vain curiosity to penetrate. Neither can it be safe to indulge our imagination upon points in which we have no sure guidance of inspiration to keep us in the truth. Error is ever pregnant with evil, and when we build our faith upon human probabilities alone, and regulate our devotions by feelings which we choose to call unerring instincts, there is no end to the foolishness of doctrine and practice into which we may fall."—(pp. 90, 91.)

There still remain, two admirable discourses *on the Lord's Supper*; but our space is exhausted. We have already made large extracts from these admirable pieces,—let our readers go for the rest to the publication itself. It is one which no theologian should be without; while at the same time its simplicity and plainness of speech render it suitable and interesting, even to the great mass of the purchasers of religious books. We often regret that Mr. Benson publishes so little: the appearance of such productions as these is not calculated to diminish our regret; but it does compel us to admit, that even so small a contribution as the present, lays the Christian world under deeper obligation than we should owe to most other writers, even for a series of volumes.

SUMMER AND WINTER IN THE PYRENEES. By the
Author of the "Women of England," &c., &c. London and
Paris : *Fisher*.

Few writers, it is stated in the preface to this work, have made the Pyrenees the subject of their observations, and of these not one who has written more recently than eight or ten years ago ; while, according to Mrs. Ellis, the annual influx of strangers into this part of France, consequent upon the increased facilities for travelling, and the improvements in the accommodation of visitors, is so great, that nothing can be regarded as unchanged in the course of ten years, excepting the wild majestic mountain scenery, and the everlasting hills themselves. Indeed, the Mayor of Pau declared to the authoress, that the town would be completely Anglicized, if he could only ensure two requisites with neither of which the English could dispense for any length of time ; a clergyman—and beef. Not pretending, therefore, to observations of a scientific or political nature, the authoress contents herself with detailing the impressions made on her own mind, from the scenes and circumstances around her ; considering this as the proper sphere of usefulness for one who can " advance no claims to attention on the ground of superior attainments." Whether she has judged rightly or not may be matter of opinion—but certainly she has produced a very lively, agreeable, and interesting work ; one abounding in those graphic sketches, both of domestic mischances, and extraforaneous adventures (as Johnson would have called them) which for the time seem to constitute the reader an associate of the writer, and enable him, while reclining on his sofa, or enjoying the luxury of a winter fireside, to ascend the summit of the Tourmalet, and look around on the amphitheatre of Gavarnie.

It is, further, a great recommendation of this work, that it has not been written against time. A residence of fifteen months in the vicinity of the Pyrenees afforded Mrs. Ellis the opportunity to arrange and methodize and finish off her lively sketches, and to retrench the exuberance of first impressions, by comparing the subjects which had delighted or astonished her, not only with those which she had left behind, but with the corresponding scenes of beauty or of magnificence which spread themselves all around her. The volume will be especially valuable to families, who contemplate a residence of some duration in this mild and propitious climate, both as it regards the provision of comforts at home, and the pursuit of enjoyment abroad ; and not the less so, as Mrs. Ellis is by no means destitute of what our old acquaintance Uncle

Selby in Sir Charles Grandison is wont to term *femalities*—e. g. the culinary requisites, without which no English menage could be comfortable, and which no French lodging-house keeper would provide. “For the want of cleanliness, and the general discomfort in the appearance of the houses, I had been in great measure prepared; but I confess there was one privation which it baffled my philosophy to sustain, and that was the want of tea! I therefore made it a great point, in settling in our new abode, to lay in a large stock of this precious article, and with the satisfaction of a true Englishwoman I ordered it to be brought up, on the first evening of our arrival at our lodgings. What, then, was my surprise to find that there was no such thing as a kettle in the house, that there never had been, and that neither the wants nor the wishes of a French family included this important and familiar accompaniment to an English fireside.”

The price of Mrs. Ellis's book will be more than repaid in solid and substantial comfort, if every family which shall purchase it be thus instructed to make part of their travelling equipage a teakettle. But, as the English cook was not only compelled to teach the Frenchman how to prepare the English pudding, but to provide the pudding-cloth, so it will not be sufficient to place the kettle in the hands of a French servant, unless you teach her also how to make the water boil. Mrs. Ellis thus amusingly details the tragi-comical catastrophe of her first essay in tea-making at Pau :—

“Water may certainly be boiled without a kettle, but it is said there is not a servant in all France who understands the virtue of boiling water. Warm water they will bring you, because it is sufficient for all their purposes; but you must stand over it yourself, and that every time it is required, to see that it actually does boil, or it will be brought to you of the temperature of new milk. Ours was of this temperature on the evening I had ordered tea with such pleasant anticipations, and the servant having put in a few leaves of tea, and told me it was ready, I poured it out, as clear and colourless as if it had been pure water. When at last a kettle was bought, it was always brought up and placed flat upon the table with the tea-cups.”

But the worst remains yet untold. Mrs. Glasse, whose memory is dear to all adepts in gastronomy, was accustomed to prescribe, as the essential preliminary of cooking, “first *catch* your fish.” So Mrs. Ellis advises her fair readers, not only to provide the kettle, and instruct the French Phillis (not neat-handed) how to boil water, as prerequisites for making tea, but to come prepared with the article itself. There is no tea to be found in Pau, or indeed nearer than Toulouse, which is worthy of the name; and the stock we had purchased with so much satisfaction proved to be nothing better than some kind of astringent herb with a strong flavour of turpentine.”—(p. 54.)

This is a utilitarian age ; though, according to Mr. Sewell, none but shallow-minded people deal with practical questions. Making tea, however, especially where the *genius loci* precludes all hope of finding any one to make it for you, is a practical question of no small importance to English people who study comfort ; and therefore we think we do well to recommend Mrs. Ellis's book, at first setting out, on the ground of its utility. She can do something more than "babble of green fields," and rave in superlatives and hyperbolicals about mountain majesty ; but she can describe scenery also, when occasion requires, and do it well. She is peculiarly happy also in her mode of interspersing historical reminiscences and associations ; and there is a great deal more, in consequence, to be learnt from her book than what the authoress did, or what the authoress felt. We would particularly instance her notices of Marguerite de Valais, Jeanne d'Albret, Catharine of Navarre, and the early nurture and education of Henry IV. In short, all that during one period of French history made the Bearnois classic ground, is grouped most agreeably in these pages, and imparts a more enduring and instructive interest than any mere descriptions, however vivid and imaginative, could possess. Nor is the work devoid of anecdotes, few but choice, of distinguished living personages, among whom we were particularly pleased with the following of the present King of Sweden.

Amongst many other circumstances equally illustrative of the good feeling and good sense of Bernadotte, we are told that "he writes every year to the father of a gentleman in Pau, a letter of pure friendship, reminding him of the days when they were both boys at school together. He continues to extend to the relatives whom he has left behind him in his native land such tokens of remembrance as are best calculated to increase their happiness. Instead of drawing them away from the sphere of comfort and respectability to which they have been accustomed, or disturbing the even tenor of their lives by ambitious hopes, his benevolence flows back to the place of his birth, through various channels, it is true, but far more calculated to benefit the friend of his early years."—(p. 164.) So far from attempting to conceal the obscurity of his origin, we saw, says Mrs. Ellis, the following inscription, on a marble tablet, fixed into the wall of a house not many paces from our residence :—

CHARLES JEAN BERNADOTTE,
Roi de Suede ;
Appelé au trône
Par le vœu unanime des Suédois,
est né dans cette maison,
le 26 Janvier, 1763.

This, it must be admitted, is creditable in the highest degree,

and affords reason to hope that the profession of Protestantism by Bernadotte is somewhat more sincere than that of Romanism by his royal fellow-citizen, Henry IV., who was also born at Pau. Mrs. Ellis speaks (page 57) of a celebrated restaurateur, Tourné, who had attracted such a degree of excellence in his "establishment artistique," that a French gastronome exclaimed, in an ecstasy of enthusiasm, "The city of Pau has produced but two great men, Henry IV., and Tourné." Into this illustrious society we may surely claim admission for Charles John as a third.

But the chief recommendation of this work is, as might be expected from the character of the authoress, the high tone of moral and religious feeling by which it is pervaded, which, without effort or affectation, is, as it ought to be, blended with the narrative. Mrs. Ellis is not serious and sentimental out of place. She does not, like many writers of the dissenting school, compose under the constraint of interspersing a certain proportion of matter strictly or constructively evangelical: her observations of this character seem to rise naturally from the scenery or objects which she is contemplating, and come, therefore, with double effect. We will close our citations with two passages of that character, which will exhibit the powers of the authoress in the higher departments of composition, and prove how well she is qualified to add to her native literature productions of a more enduring, if not more pleasing interest, than her "Recollections of the Pyrenees." It would be no easy task to parallel the beauty and delicacy of the passage which terminates the latter extract; and, rejoiced indeed should we be, if by those who travel such objects were regarded, and by those who wrote such feelings were expressed:—

"On the evening of our arrival at Luz, we walked to the top of a little hill, crowned with the ruins of a hermitage, and jutting out into the valley, so as to command a view, not only of the entrance of the gorge through which we had passed, but of the two other defiles which terminate in the basin of Luz—that of Gavarnie, through which flow the foaming waters of the Gave,—and that of Baréges, presenting a less lovely aspect, from the dreadful ravages to which it is subject, when the winter floods have swollen the wilder and more furious Bastan, whose torrent mingles with the Gave in the valley of Luz.

"Well might the hermit, if such a being did ever really occupy the rudely constructed building on this little hill, have sought this situation for its beauty and repose. Nothing I have ever seen or felt, or perhaps shall ever see and feel again, can surpass this lovely scene, for the perfect picture of peace presented by its evening aspect. If one requisite for the enjoyment of peace be a sense of security, we find it here in the majestic mountains rising on every hand, some to the height of six or seven thousand feet above the level of the verdant plain or hollow, which lies before you, extending to the distance of about two miles in length, and one in breadth. If in order to calm the stirrings of anxiety and apprehension, which the accustomed habits of the world have rendered a second nature, it is necessary for our peace, that we should see around us the industry of man, facilitating the produce of a fruitful soil, we have it here in more than ordinary perfection; for not only in the valley,

but far up the sides of these majestic mountains, at an altitude never reached by the cultivation of colder climes, are thousands of little barns and cottages, their white gables gleaming out from clumps of tufted wood; and villages, with their little rustic churches, sometimes half buried in the deep ravines; at others, standing out like fairy citadels, on the point of some bold promontory, which catches the beams of the declining sun. And then the rich deep woods with which some of the lateral hills are crowned, and the patches of different kinds of cultivation, extending to an almost miraculous height, all different in their tints, yet all blending into a beautiful mosaic, in perfect harmony with the colouring of a southern climate. If again, there is a craving in the human mind for something beyond what belongs to the bare notion of utility, a craving which perhaps destroys our peace more than all the actual necessities of life, for something to fill, and satisfy, and render perfect, the enjoyment of the spiritual part of our nature, we are surely brought nearest to it in a situation like this, when the mind is impressed with conceptions of the boundless power, and equally boundless beneficence of its Creator.

I am aware that this is not religion, and that the requirements of Christian duty may direct our steps to paths of a far different nature. I am aware, also, that difficult, or even ordinary and obscure as these paths may at first appear, He to whom all things are possible, may diffuse around them an attractiveness, and a beauty, as far surpassing all material excellence, as spiritual enjoyment is raised above that which belongs merely to the body; but I still think it has so pleased the Creator of the universe, to endow the mind of man with an intuitive sense of the loveliness and magnificence of nature—a sympathy which lets in the power of beauty, as it were a flood upon the soul: and I believe it is good that the spirit should be thus refreshed, and consistent with the wise purposes of God, that the hills, and the streams, and the verdant earth, and the fertility of the smiling landscape, with the calm of evening spread over it, should give us afresh to rejoice in his goodness, and to feel that there is such a thing as peace, even in this world, where the repose we are all in want of, is so often and so fatally destroyed by our own tumultuous passions.”—(pp. 248—251.)

“Still, if the object of travel be to fill the mind with the contemplation of what is great and glorious in the works of the Creator, and the heart with feelings of contentment and repose, perhaps we succeeded in this object as completely as we could have done in any other way, by tracing out the shady paths that wind around the sides of the hills more immediately surrounding Luz, by watching the hay-makers at work in the valley, and by resigning ourselves to the dreamy silence, and the quiet beauty of these never-to-be-forgotten scenes. I speak of the silence of this valley; for the perpetual murmur of its streams, is no interruption to that soul-felt stillness, which the language of poetry so often describes as silence. It is well for those who have youth and health to bear them on, or for those whose object is to tell of the many points of interest they have visited, to hurry on from place to place, and crowd a world of images into the recollection of a single day; but if the object is, as I confess it has often been with me, to thank God and be still, it is better to wander out alone, or with one quiet companion, to trace the herdsman's path, to sit down when weary, to converse with the peasants, to enter their cottages, to gather wild flowers, and to watch, without excitement or fatigue, the wonder-working process by which *the beauty of each day is developed by the morning light, and folded back as it were, into the bosom of nature, with the dewy fall of every night.*”—(pp. 257, 258.)

SHORT NOTICES.

THE REMNANT FOUND ; or, the Place of Israel's Hiding Discovered. By the Rev. JACOB SAMUEL.

THE NESTORIANS ; or, the Lost Tribes. By ASAHEL GRANT, M.D.

THE growing interest which the Church of Christ has taken of late years in the state and prospects of the Jews is one of the most remarkable features of the present times. No clearer token could be given us that "the time to favour Zion" is indeed near at hand. A more distinct mark of the same cheering truth is to be found in the renewed enquiries after the lost tribes of Israel. For a long time, whatever partial interest might have been felt towards the dispersed sons of Judah, the outcasts of Israel seem to have been nearly forgotten by Christians in general ; but now it seems almost as if the predicted command had been given to them that are in darkness, "Shew yourselves." An intense interest has been aroused to search for these outcasts wherever they may be found, which appears a lively pledge that the time is indeed approaching and near at hand, when "all Israel shall be saved."

The two works before us are devoted to this object of ascertaining the present condition of the Ten Tribes. Both agree in searching for them, in or near the site of their first captivity. Mr. Samuel thinks that they are to be found in the Jews of Daghistan, on the north west of the Caspian. He adduces several striking features of their customs and observances, which distinguish them from the Jews in general, and seem to correspond with what might be expected in the captivity of Israel.

The work of Dr. Grant is of still higher interest. It consists of three parts, the first of which is a personal narrative of his intercourse with the Nestorian Christians, with a view to the establishment of an American mission. The second part contains evidence of their Israelitish origin, and the third some discussions upon the prophecies of the apocalypse in the same connection. The details brought forward at length in the second part have a peculiar and uncommon interest, and we see not how it is possible to resist the conclusion that the Nestorian, or as they call themselves, Nazarean Christians, of Adiabene, are indeed descendants of the ten tribes, who were converted in the apostolic age on the

very site of their first captivity. So far the conclusions drawn by Dr. Grant seem warranted by very full and convincing evidence. And certainly, however remote, in one aspect, from the general impression prevailing in the Church, they open to our view an impressive field of meditation upon the deep counsels of God.

We cannot, however, resist the conviction that the mystery which attaches to these lost tribes is still very partially unravelled, and that further discoveries will be made in the Time of the End, beside that which the present works convey. The early tradition, recorded in the Apocrypha, of a further migration eastward, seems not at all improbable; and till the cloud of darkness is removed which still hangs over the first peopling of the western continent, it is not perhaps an unreasonable flight of speculative fancy, to suppose that in America the tide of civilization has overtaken some of the outcasts from the first covenant in their farthest wanderings. The wisdom of God will doubtless, before long, unseal some of these hidden mysteries of His providence, and display to us fresh heights and depths of wonder in the counsels of His redeeming love. In the meantime these works, especially the second, are valuable contributions to our knowledge of this interesting subject.

Besides the interest which attaches to Dr. Grant's researches, from the light which they throw upon the probable history of the Ten Tribes, they are certainly a valuable addition to our knowledge of Central Asia, and of the Eastern Churches. At a time when our own Church has such encouraging prospects of extension in the Levant, and on the side of Palestine, all information of this kind is more than commonly important. We hope that many will read and examine for themselves the remarkable facts which are here brought before them.

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1841.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE STATUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. By GEORGE PEACOCK, D.D., V.P.R.S., &c., Dean of Ely. London: *Parker*. 1841.

CLERICAL EDUCATION *considered with an especial reference to the Universities; in a Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Lichfield.* By the Rev. CHARLES PERRY, M.A., Fellow and late Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: *Parker*. 1841.

PROPOSAL FOR THE INSTITUTION OF AN ELEMENTARY COURSE OF THEOLOGICAL STUDY, *preparatory to Holy Orders, in the University of Cambridge.* Dated Christ's College Lodge, April 26, 1841.

FIVE SERMONS, *on the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, preached before the University of Cambridge, in January, 1841. To which is added, a proposed Plan for the Introduction of a Systematic Study of Theology in the University, by Students designed for the Church, after taking their B.A. Degree.* By the Rev. JAMES HILDYARD, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Christ's College. London: *Rivingtons*. 1841.

IN our last number we glanced at the important subject of CHURCH EXTENSION. But we could not restrain ourselves from contemplating this grave question in its obvious connection with another, equally momentous with itself, and rendered by existing circum-

stances, if possible, even more immediately and imperatively urgent—we mean, CLERICAL EDUCATION. Availing ourselves, for obvious reasons, of the apposite language of the Roman poet, we readily admit that

“ Principio sedes apibus statioque petenda ;”

but, when the habitation is provided, we shall have accomplished little, unless we advance one step further, and cause it to be occupied by an industrious colony. In order to this, we must task the labours of those who

“ spem gentis, adultos
Educunt foetus ;”

and thus we may best hope to effect another and a kindred object, which is also safely and conveniently expressed in the same metaphorical language,

“ Ignavum, fucos, pecus a præsepibus arcent.”—(Virg. Georg. iv.)

In plain language, if, after having erected churches, we would have them occupied by an active, assiduous, devoted, and intelligent clergy, and not by such as have been gibbeted in “ Village Dialogues,” under the too significant appellations of Parson Doolittle, and Dr. Dronish, we must make some better provision for procuring a “ supply of fit and able men, duly qualified to serve God in the ministry of the Gospel,” than is at present afforded by the arrangements of our two great national Universities. Over the portals of each might it be inscribed, “ One thing thou lackest”—and that one thing is the union of sound learning and religious education, on such a plan as shall recognise the paramount importance of the second, without detracting from or depreciating the acknowledged usefulness of the first.

Supposing, however, that any of the various expedients which the present generation, prodigal of promises and prolific of reforms, has devised for correcting the errors of its predecessors, should be applied in this instance with success; supposing that the profession for which, according to the Dean of Ely, “ at least one-half of the students in the University are designed” (we might probably say, with greater approximation to the truth, *two-thirds*) were admitted to its due pre-eminence in the system of academical instruction; supposing that theology, as a science, were adequately studied, and religion, as a principle, effectually enforced, would the resources of the Universities be even then sufficient to counterpoise the exigencies of the Church? Were consecrated Houses of Prayer so multiplied throughout the length and breadth of the land, that our admirable parochial system, already perfect in

theory, could become perfect also in operation ; and every flock of Christ should possess its own shepherd, and every sheep of Christ his own fold—would it be within the ability of the sister Universities to provide that there never should be wanting a fit supply of persons duly qualified to serve God in feeding the flock which He hath purchased with His own blood ? The two questions are perfectly distinct ; first, whether the academical system, more especially that of Cambridge, does all that it is competent to do in the great work of clerical education ; secondly, whether it is capable, under any conceivable extension or modification, of doing what is required under the present circumstances of the Church ? To both these questions we answer, without the slightest hesitation, in the negative, and we proceed to state the grounds on which we have arrived at this conclusion. Having done this, we shall endeavour to indicate some means of palliating an evil, for which, at present, we entertain but little hope to find a remedy.

Without entering at any length into statistical details respecting the amount of Church Extension required by the country, in order to the efficient and perfect administration of the parochial system, we may safely assume as a general principle, that the existing number of clergymen requires to be increased at least one-half, i.e. from 12,000 to 18,000 *at the least* ; and if we spread that increase over a period of thirty years, there will be an annual advance of at least 200 on the present yearly ordinations. But what is the amount of the present supply ? In the diocese of London, we believe, the average of annual ordinations at present ranges between 30 and 40, and we may therefore take one-half the smaller number, or 15, as the average of each diocese throughout England and Wales, which would give (15×26) 390 for the entire year. Now, in the year 1840, the number of determining bachelors at Cambridge was 344, and assuming the proportion to be the same from Oxford, we shall have a total of 700 from the two Universities, of whom about one-half, according to Dean Peacock, may be reckoned as theological students, designed for the service of the Christian ministry. But the annual demand, as we have seen, may be estimated at $(390 + 200)$ 590, while the annual supply cannot be reckoned to amount to more than 350, leaving a deficiency of 240, considerably more than one-third of the whole, and falling even below the number which would be required to maintain the existing Establishment, supposing not a single additional church to be erected throughout the kingdom. Allowing, therefore, for the University of Durham, with the Colleges of St. Bees and Lampeter, we think we are far within the mark, when we assume that the existing establishments for clerical education can only supply three-fourths of the number

of young clergymen which must be annually required, in order to maintain an adequate and efficient supply of ministers in the Church.

The question, however, is not only one of number, but of qualification also. It must not be too hastily assumed, that the addition to a name of the initials which mark the graduate implies an adequate proficiency in those studies, which are essential to the proper discharge of the functions of the ministry. Dean Peacock has said nothing to the disparagement of his Alma Mater, whom, we believe, he regards with filial affection, and among whose sons he has long since achieved an honourable name, when he characterizes the university studies "as the *basis* of a sound education," and affirms it to be "less the proper object of academical education to complete the fabric of human knowledge, than to provide a firm and secure basis on which it may be raised." Consequently, it too generally happens, "that the academical life of the students is concluded before their theological studies have begun;" and whether a sufficient interval for the prosecution of these primarily important studies is usually interposed between the admission to deacon's orders and the time of graduation;—whether, in the absence of any academical stimulants, requirements, or even facilities, that interval is ordinarily so occupied, that all is even done that *might* be done;—whether too many are not content with the *minimum* of theological attainment, which will enable them to pass the ordeal of the Bishop's examination, we may leave those who are best acquainted with human nature, and with the moral statistics of our universities, to decide. We entirely accord with Dean Peacock's assertion, that the fundamental studies of the university between admission and the first degree are general and not professional; and our experience of the past, of long duration though not equal to his own, constrains us, however reluctantly, to concur in his prediction, that "all attempts to combine them (i. e. the subjects of general and professional study) will be in vain, unless they can be included in the examination for honours as well as for ordinary degrees." Whether this may or may not be expedient, will be considered in the sequel; at present it may suffice to observe, in the Dean's words, "that graduates of Cambridge present themselves to the Bishop as candidates for holy orders without any academical or other testimonial of theological proficiency beyond a certificate of attendance upon the lectures of the Norrisian professor;" and though "anxious efforts have been made by many colleges to encourage the study of theology by lectures, by examinations, and by prizes," these have only tended to palliate, not to remove the evil. A distinguished place in the Tripos, like charity, covers a

multitude of theological negligences and failures, if not, occasionally, of moral obliquities also—so that, if it would be too much to say, that the most distinguished scholars are often the most shallow theologians and the most indolent or indifferent parochial ministers, yet the practical result may be accurately stated in the inoffensive because indefinite terms of the Dean's too well-founded affirmation, that "no branch of study can be pursued with diligence or effect, where a minimum of knowledge only, and that adapted to the capacity of the humblest student, is demanded; more particularly when it is combined with other studies whose successful prosecution is rewarded with the highest honours and the most lucrative emoluments of the university."

It appears then from these premises, and we prefer to state the conclusion in the words of Mr. Hildyard—"that the University of Cambridge can hardly with consistency lay claim to the title of being a seminary of sound learning and religious education, without making instruction in religion of at least equal importance to that in the other branches of her academical system of tuition." On this conclusion, however, we ground another of our own; that the graduates of the University of Cambridge (and we believe the same assertion to be little, if at all, less applicable to Oxford) cannot be considered as qualified, by their academical probation alone, for the solemn and serious responsibilities of the Christian ministry. That many of them indeed *are* qualified, *highly* qualified, we entirely believe and thankfully allow; but the merit of this rests wholly with themselves, and we know also, that examples of the very opposite character are but too numerous; and that, if our modern prelates are not constrained to declare with the conscientious, though at times wrong-headed, Bishop Burnet, that the Ember weeks are the grief and burden of their lives, through the general ignorance and incompetency of those who present themselves for ordination, yet the standard of average attainment is lowered far beyond what it ought to be, in consequence of the predominance of secular studies in the probationary academical cause. "We [must] dispense altogether," says Mr. Hildyard, "with what might reasonably be considered the chief object of an institution, professedly designed for training up a supply of the regular clergy of the land; or some method must be adopted, by which a short course of divinity may be engrafted on the stock of acquirement already possessed in the other branches of learning by the recently graduated B.A." Now, no such system has been yet adopted—consequently, we are impaled upon the other horn of the dilemma—and no alternative is left us but to conclude, that the University of Cambridge "dispenses altogether with what might

be reasonably considered her chief object—the training up an adequate supply of the regular clergy of the land.”

It is only fair to state, that there are many attached and distinguished sons of our Alma Mater, who would join issue with Mr. Hildyard on the question whether this is the chief object of the university; whether she is not designed for general rather than professional training; whether more can be fairly expected of her, than to lay the foundation on which the superstructure of theological learning may be reared. Into this controversy, however, which has long been, and we think will continue longer still to be, *sub judice*, we do not enter, because, whichever way it may be decided, the consequence to the Church is the same. Her supply from the academical nurseries is not, as to a large proportion, a supply of persons *duly qualified*, unless due qualification consist in “a knowledge of one at least of the Four Gospels, and of the Acts of the Apostles, and of the Evidences of Christianity, and of Moral Philosophy, as they appear in the works of Paley.” This the Dean of Ely admits to be “a very elementary and limited portion of the most important of human studies,” but it is all which the university enforces and exacts, and more than some of her graduates—those who are indulged with a bare permission to pass—can be supposed to have acquired. Hence, without any reference to that which is a more flagrant and pernicious evil, the inadequacy of the testimonials to moral character, we determine, without hesitation, in answer to our first enquiry, that the existing academical system does NOT effect all which might be reasonably expected, and even justly required from it, in the great work of Clerical Education; and that the time is now arrived, when such alterations and improvements as the experience of past generations may suggest are urgently demanded by the circumstances of the Church, in order to provide both more, and more efficient, ministers of the gospel of Christ. How this may be accomplished we now proceed, from the documents before us, to investigate.

Dean Peacock and Mr. Hildyard seem to agree, that it is not expedient, even if it would be practicable, “to adopt any plan for the systematic cultivation of theology, during the ordinary period of residence requisite for obtaining the first degree of B.A.” At the same time, they admit, that to prolong the residence would be to increase the expenditure of the student, and thus to exclude persons of limited resources, at the very time when it would be most desirable to facilitate the admission into holy orders of persons intellectually and morally qualified. Bishop Monk in like manner considers, “that an open competition in theological knowledge, at a suitable period after all the other trials of juvenile proficiency, will be found at

once the most effectual and the most profitable measure." And even Mr. Perry, than whom few have more ample means of knowing, and none more kindliness of heart and liberality of act in aiding, the struggles which are made by students of limited resources to maintain a decent and reputable appearance, deprecates all interference with the course of instruction preparatory to the B.A. degree. He even goes so far as to suggest, "that no person should be allowed to enter his name as a student in theology, until after he has proceeded to the degree of Bachelor of Arts." Now this provision, we entertain no doubt whatever—or indeed *any* provision, which necessarily prolonged the period of academical study, would be fatal to the entire scheme;—would operate to diminish the number of candidates for ordination in a far greater degree, than it would tend to elevate their standard of theological attainment. Unwilling, therefore, as we must be to come into collision with such authorities, all entitled to the highest deference, and one endeared to us by sentiments of personal esteem, we are yet constrained to express an opinion decidedly in opposition to them all. To a certain extent, indeed, there is no difference between us. We agree with Bishop Monk, that "the only substantial test of knowledge is examination, and that the university needs a system of theological distinctions similar to those which operate upon the classical and philosophical student with such success" *—we differ only as to the *time* at which the test should be applied. We agree with Dean Peacock that "a very beneficial change might be effected by the reduction of the period of residence required for the degree of B.A. from ten terms to eight, the degree being taken in the ninth term;" we agree with Mr. Hildyard that "such residence would preferably commence in the Lent term," thus avoiding the inconvenience of having the men of four years' resident during one term, and either displacing the questionists to make room for the freshmen, or dispersing the latter into various parts of the town, instead of receiving them beneath the parental roof of the college—but we differ from both in our estimate of the benefits which such an alteration might be expected to produce. It would be a mitigation, not a correction, of the existing evil—it would be a palliative of the Church's destitution, not the supply of her demand—it would leave the study of theology, as it finds it, in a false or, at least, an unseemly position; it would, in many cases, bestow relief where it is *not* required, and perhaps, in many more, substitute additional incumbrance for it where it *is*. It would relieve the general student (often to his own detriment) at the expense of the professional; and were its requirements, its attendances, its examinations, compulsory on all

* Sermon at the installation of the Chancellor, 1835.

applicants for ordination (and such they must be in order to become effective) it would, even if it extended only through a single year, impose upon the professional student both a period of residence and an amount of expenditure, from which the general student would be exempt. Our proposition, therefore, assuming with Bishop Monk "that examination is the only substantial test of knowledge," would be, first, the extension of theological subjects in the general examination for B.A.—and secondly, the institution of a theological tripos—a voluntary theological examination of B.A.—*not*, as in the Classical Tripos, "who shall have obtained mathematical honours," but who shall have attended, during their three years of residence, the lectures of the Three Divinity Professors, or any such portions of the subjoined scheme of Dean Peacock as shall be determined by a Syndicate to be appointed for that purpose.

"We should be disposed," says the Dean, "to recommend regular and systematic courses of lectures, to be given every year on the following subjects:—

"1. On the Doctrines, Liturgy, and Articles of our Church, by the Norrisonian Professor.

"2. On the Canon of Scripture, and the Writings and Opinions of the Early Fathers, by the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity.

"3. On Biblical Criticism, more especially of the Language and Books of the New Testament.

"4. On Ecclesiastical History, more particularly of the first four centuries after Christ.

"5. On the Hebrew Language, by the Regius Professor of Hebrew."

But, instead of 6. Moral Philosophy, &c., or in addition to it, we would gladly see a Professor of Pastoral Theology, whose office it would be, agreeably to Mr. Perry's suggestion (p. 21), "to instruct his class in matters relating directly to their future pastoral duties, such as the composition and delivery of Sermons—the reading of the Lessons and Liturgy—the interpretation of the Rubrics and Canons—the knowledge of the more important particulars of the Ecclesiastical Law, and such general rules as can be given in a lecture-room for the management of parochial schools," &c. There are, indeed, no existing professorships at Cambridge for Biblical Criticism and Ecclesiastical History; but they have already been established at Oxford, and we venture to hope, with the Dean of Ely, that measures will speedily be taken for the institution of similar professorships in our own University; for we can conceive of nothing more consistent with the avowed principle of a government which is "determined to maintain, on their ancient foundations, the institutions of the country in Church and State," yet at the same time "not disposed to resist such changes as the altered circumstances of the country may require," * than to recommend that the revenues of the two stalls in Ely Cathedral, which it is proposed to

* Sir Robert Peel's Speech at Tamworth.

suspend, might be appropriated for their endowment. If it were thought expedient to exact attendance upon the whole seven courses, thus arranged and compacted into a complete system of theological instruction, no difficulty would be experienced by the professed student of theology in bringing them within the prescribed period of the ten terms which are now required for residence; while, if the certificates of the Professors were the sole condition of attendance on the examination for theological honours, those students who were emulative of general as well as of professional distinction, might be admitted to compete in any stage of the triennium which interposes between the degrees of B.A. and M.A. Thus, we think, might be obviated some of the principal objections to the "Proposal for the Institution of an Elementary Course of Theological Study preparatory to Holy Orders," which was brought forward before the Senate of Cambridge in May last, and the appointment of a Syndicate to consider which, was rejected by a majority of 42 to 25. The proposal consisted of two parts: the former recommending that the course of study for the degree of Bachelor of Arts should be completed within the period of nine terms, or three academical years; the latter exhibiting the plan of the proposed examination in theology. Now, we do not think that, between these two parts of the scheme, there was any necessary connection; and we *do* think that the rejection of the second was mainly imputable to its association with the first. There are many members of the Senate, we believe, who would resolutely resist any organic change in the constitution and customs of the University. There are some, perhaps, who would have considered the *extension* of the academical course preferable to its *abridgment*, and voted for an increase of two terms rather than a diminution of one; but neither the one nor the other might object to allow of an additional examination (looking to the successful precedent of the Classical Tripos);—an addition, too, which would in no case have the effect of abbreviating residence, while the students who aimed at professional as well as literary or mathematical distinction, and with whom increased expenditure was not a primary concern, would rather be disposed to extend the term. We trust, therefore, as the motion is to be again brought forward after the re-assembling of the University in October next, that it will be so modified as to afford the Senate an opportunity of adopting, if it please, the second part of the proposal; the plan of an Examination in Theology—which it is obviously competent to do, as in the instance of the Classical Tripos, without any petition to the Queen, except indeed for the establishment of the two Professorships of Biblical Criticism and Ecclesias-

tical History, and their endowment with the suspended stalls of Ely. We give the particulars of the plan, premising that the only alteration which we would propose would be in Article 1, "all persons voluntarily offering themselves, not of the degree or standing of M.A., who shall bring certificates of having attended the courses of the Professors of Divinity (Hebrew), (Biblical Criticism), (Ecclesiastical History), (and Pastoral Theology), since the period of their matriculation."

**" II. PLAN OF AN EXAMINATION IN THEOLOGY AFTER ADMISSION
AD RESPONDENDUM QUÆSTIONI.**

" 1. That in the Lent Term of the year 1845, and of every subsequent year, there be an Examination in theology of all persons, voluntarily offering themselves, who shall have been admitted, *ad respondendum quæstioni*, before the end of the preceding Easter Term, and shall have resided during the Michaelmas Term next before the examination, and during the Lent Term in which it takes place.

" 2. That such examination commence upon the last Monday but one in the Lent Term, and be continued upon the next following Tuesday and Wednesday, and also upon the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of the succeeding week.

" 3. That the examination be conducted by four Examiners, to be annually nominated by the Vice-Chancellor, the Regius, Margaret, and Norrisian Professors of Divinity, the Regius Professor of Hebrew, and the Regius Professor of Greek.

" 4. That the names of the persons so nominated to conduct the examination of any year be submitted to the Senate, for their approbation, at the first Congregation in the Easter Term of the preceding year.

" 5. That the subjects of examination be:—A portion of the Old Testament in Hebrew, to be selected by the persons who nominate the Examiners—The New Testament in Greek, or such parts of it as shall be selected by the same persons—Scripture History. Such of the undermentioned books, or such portions of them, as shall be selected by the same authority:—Gray's Key to the Old Testament—Beausobre's Introduction to the Reading of the New Testament—Allix's Reflections on the Books of Scripture—Butler's Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature—Grotius de Veritate Religionis Christianæ—Paley's Evidences of Christianity—Paley's Horæ Paulinæ—Lardner's History of the Apostles and Evangelists—Mosheim's Commentaries on the Affairs of the Christians before the Time of Constantine—Burnet's Abridgment of his History of the Reformation of the Church of England—Juelli Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ—Noelli Catechismus—Burnet's Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.

" 6. That public notice of the subjects of examination for any year be given by the Vice-Chancellor on the last Saturday in the Easter Term of the preceding year.

" 7. That the examination be conducted by means of printed papers.

" 8. That the Candidates, who shall have passed the examination to the satisfaction of the Examiners, be arranged in two classes, each in alphabetical order; the first class indicating distinguished merit, regard being had both to general proficiency and to excellence in particular branches of the examination; the second, and, as may generally be expected, the most numerous class, denoting a creditable measure of attainment.

" 9. That the classes be published on the first day of the Easter Term immediately following the examination."

In submitting this proposal, we derive no inconsiderable encouragement from the fact, that Dean Peacock does not concur with Mr. Perry and Mr. Hildyard in their opinion, "that no person should be allowed to enter his name as a student in theology until after he has proceeded to the degree of Bachelor of Arts."—(Perry, p. 24.) On the contrary,

"Though we have assumed," writes the Dean, "that these lectures would be generally attended in the year immediately succeeding the bachelor's degree, yet there seems no sufficient reason for confining it to that specific period. Those, whose time and attention were not altogether occupied with the general studies of the University, would probably endeavour to attend them as under-graduates, and thus save the expense and inconvenience of an additional year of residence in the University; while many others would defer it till they had decided upon the choice of their profession, or until they had obtained a respite from other and more pressing claims upon their time. In all cases a certificate of attendance upon the lectures, and of a sufficient acquaintance with the subjects of them, would be considered an indispensable qualification for admission to the Church (ministry). There can be little doubt but that the adoption of such a system would promptly raise the general standard of the theological attainments of those who are candidates for holy orders, and would enable the University to do justice to the most important of its functions, as one of the two great national nurseries for supplying the Church with a well-trained and learned clergy."—(Peacock, pp. 169, 170.)

If, then, the subject be revived, as it is intended, in November next (and in the present exigence of the Church to defer the consideration of this grave question would be an act of treason to her, and of suicidal indifference to the interests of the University itself), we would earnestly entreat those who shall take the lead in this most important movement, to reconsider and remodel the plan of additional theological examinations, which they propose to submit, if a Syndicate shall be appointed for the purpose. We would implore them—nothing doubting that they are as deeply interested in the measure as ourselves—not to hazard the success of the latter part of their scheme, which involves no organic change, by associating it with the former, which does. Individually, we concur with them in *both* members of their plan: we should rejoice to see the academical course comprehended within the term of three full years;—and we know that it would be a great advantage to many, and we think it would prove no detriment to the University itself, if residence were to commence in the Lent rather than in the October term. But an object of interest far transcending, and indeed wholly absorbing all considerations of this nature, is the fulfilment of the just expectations of the country, and the Church, which demand from Cambridge, as one of the two great national nurseries, its fair proportion of a well-trained and learned clergy. Mr. Perry affirms, "that the superintendence of the

theological branch of clerical education ought to be confided by the Church to the Universities ;” and assuredly none who concur with him in this opinion will impugn the correlative obligation of the Universities to provide suitable courses of instruction in theology. Candidates for ordination, if deficient in learning, are a discredit to the University ; if wanting in moral and religious training, a detriment and a dishonour to the Church. What may be, under the existing system, the proportion of those who are almost, if not altogether, such, it would be invidious to assume and painful to conjecture. We hope and believe, whatever it may have been, that it is now in process of gradual and steady diminution. But of this we are assured, that the very partial provision hitherto made by the University for the fulfilment of this, its first duty—and in many instances the express or exclusive object of its magnificent collegiate foundations—has, in days that are passed, paralyzed the energies of the Church, swelled the ranks of infidelity and dissent, and given the enemy occasion to blaspheme, when he has pointed to the flock deserted by its shepherd, or to the shepherd negligent of the flock, and paraded as the fruits of the system those who were in reality its canker and its curse.

We have thus, we trust, fulfilled our intention, in respect to the first of the two questions proposed, whether the system of clerical education now in operation at Cambridge does all which it is capable of doing towards the supply of a well-trained and learned clergy. We have affirmed, and we think demonstrated the negative ;—and we have shown, how by an extension or rather modification of its plan the reproach might be washed away, and the great and primary object of the University, as a seminary of sound learning and religious education, might, in respect of her *alumni*, be more effectually pursued and more extensively attained. But our task is not yet complete. If there is much which the Universities have as yet left undone, there is something more required which they cannot do. Their system cannot be made co-extensive with the obvious and pressing necessity of the case. We want (as we have expressed at page 456) a large body of additional ministers in the Church, taken from among the working classes, and fitted to gain the ear of the working classes—not by coarseness, or flippancy, or irreverent familiarity, but simply by doing as the Apostle did, namely, using great plainness of speech ; by the unaffected earnestness of one who labours for souls as he that must give account. We want colleges, provided with the requisite Professors, in which an humble-minded man, intent on his great object, may bring his expenses, during his college course, within £30 or £40 per annum. We want the reality of that which we possess at present

only in name. "The first step towards the restoration of the Church," says Dr. Arnold,* "seems to be the revival of deacons, which might be effected without any other change in our present system than a repeal of all laws, canons, or customs which prohibit a deacon from following any secular calling, which confer on them any civil exemptions, or subject them to any civil disqualifications. The benefit in large towns," he continues, "would be enormous, if we could have a large body of deacons, the ordained ministers of the Church, visiting the sick, managing charitable subscriptions, and sharing with their presbyter in those strictly clerical duties which now, in many cases, are too much for the health and powers of the strongest. Yet a still greater advantage would be found in the link thus formed between the clergy and the laity, by the revival of an order appertaining in a manner to both."—(pp. lxiv. lxv.) For five or seven years would we have such persons use the office of a deacon; then, at the discretion of the Bishop, they might, if found blameless, be admitted at his discretion to the higher order of the priesthood; while Graduates of either university, having passed the examination in theology, might be permitted, as they now are, to present themselves to the Bishop at the expiration of the first. Precisely a similar distinction, it is well known, obtains in the legal profession; and how far it has operated to the detriment of the universities may be seen by comparing the honours of the bar with the Oxford and Cambridge Calendars. We do not believe that by the adoption of this plan ten students would be withdrawn from the universities in as many years; but we do believe and are assured that hundreds of zealous, devoted, indefatigable ministers would thus be gained to the Church; men, who would work with peculiar efficiency among that portion of the middle classes from which hitherto dissent has most replenished its ranks. Persons of this description find the style of preaching adopted in the meeting-house more congenial, only because it is what they better understand!

Now an obvious mode of supplying men of such a stamp would seem to be, the institution of theological colleges in the various dioceses, under the superintendence of the Bishop and his Archdeacons. To this, however, an objection might be entertained, which is expressed with such happy union of force and delicacy in the letter of Mr. Perry, that we cannot do better than avail ourselves of his words:—

"I confess, my Lord, that, although I am sensible of the necessity which existed for some immediate measure, in order to meet the exigency of the case; and although I owe, and feel, the most respectful deference for the wisdom and judgment, as well as the zeal and piety, of those eminent men,

* Introduction to Christian Life, &c.

the heads of our Church, who have recently founded theological colleges in their dioceses—yet I cannot divest myself of a degree of apprehension, when I contemplate the possible issue of these institutions. The character of the instructions which will be given in them will obviously depend entirely upon the opinions of the *few* individuals by whom they may be for the time conducted; and as we know that dangerous errors have heretofore been openly avowed, even by learned and distinguished members of the Church of England, what security is there that some of these, or similar errors, may not be adopted by the very men who shall hereafter possess the superintendence of this instruction? And if such an event should at any time occur, I ask again, what security will there be against the insidious introduction of these errors, and their ultimate prevalence among the students? A fatal heresy might spring up unnoticed, and produce its baneful fruits in many a youthful mind, before the attention of the Church was directed towards it, and any effectual measure could be taken to eradicate it.

“ I trust, my Lord, that I shall be pardoned for expressing the fears which I entertain upon this point. I have been emboldened to do so, because I believe that they are felt by your Lordship, as well as by myself; and because I think, that the more fully the subject is considered the more reasonable will my apprehensions appear, and the more likelihood will there be that the claims of the Universities, which I have ventured to advocate, will be generally admitted.”—(Perry, pp. 14—16.)

We trust and pray that the apprehensions thus expressed by Mr. Perry never may be realized; that no grievous wolves may thus enter in among the flock; that no roots of bitterness, springing up even in her choicest places, may thus trouble the Church of Christ. We think, however, that we could suggest a plan by which this peril might be obviated; a plan, which we have had the opportunity of stating, in its leading feature, to the excellent Prelate to whom Mr. Perry's letter is addressed, and concerning which his lordship was of opinion, that the objection therein contained did not apply to it with equal force. It is, simply, to institute, not many diocesan, but two Provincial Theological Colleges, which should be under the government of the Bishops of the Province, with the Metropolitan as Visitor, possessing a double suffrage; one in his office as Visitor, one in his capacity as Bishop; the college for the province of Canterbury, at London; that for the province of York, at the archiepiscopal city, or at Durham—a university to which, in respect of theology at least, we may apply, in comparison of Oxford or Cambridge, the apostrophe of the poet,

“ O matre pulchrâ filia pulchrior ! ”

A university where the requisite machinery is already, in a great degree, provided, and where the unavoidable expenditure must, we should imagine, be considerably less than at either Oxford or Cambridge. The same holds equally of an Institution in London, of which his grace, the Metropolitan, is already Visitor, and the Bishop of the diocese perpetual governor—and where nothing would be required but the appointment of two or three additional Professors, who might lecture on the various departments of a theological

education, and who might be remunerated, in part by the fees from students attending their classes, and in part by the proceeds of one of the suppressed stalls of Westminster, which could hardly be more legitimately or profitably appropriated than to such a purpose. We allude, of course, to King's College, which would thus assume a higher rank than it now holds among the institutions of the country, and be far more useful to the Church at large, than in its present character of a training seminary for Oxford or Cambridge.

We are well aware that in propounding such a scheme we shall be met by manifold objections, which, however, will probably resolve themselves into two classes; first, as to the injury which this plan would inflict upon the universities, and secondly, its tendency to lower the character and estimation of the clergy. To the former we should reply, that in case of promising talents, or expected preferment, or adequate resources, the student would be so obviously a gainer by the avoidance of the long probation of a septennial or even quinquennial diaconate (for the theological course at the provincial college would extend itself over the academical term of three years) that no further inducement would be needed to the preference of the older institutions; while as to the latter we answer, that nothing could be further from our view than the depression of the existing standard of theological attainment. We would not, in the provincial colleges, abate a single item of the scheme above detailed*—the only difference which we contemplate would be, that in the one case education would be partly general—in the other, wholly professional—in the one case the candidate might be,

“Grammaticus, rhetor, geometres;”

in the other, he would be only a theologian. But it would not therefore follow, that in consequence of having given himself WHOLLY to these things, his profiting would be less manifest to all—that he would be less qualified “to assist the priest in divine service, and specially when he ministereth the holy communion, and to help in the distribution thereof; and to read holy scriptures and homilies in the Church; and to instruct the youth in the catechism; in the absence of the priest to baptize infants, and to preach, if he be admitted thereto by the bishop, and in all things to execute the office of a deacon in the Church of God.”† And whether seven years spent in the faithful performance of such duties, as a necessary probation and pre-requisite for the higher office of the priesthood, would not, in pastoral efficiency, fully equi-

* Page 488.

† Service for the Ordination of Deacons.

poise the early advantages of the university—whether the provincial student at thirty would not be as well fitted for parochial responsibilities, and as thoroughly furnished unto all good works as the graduate of twenty-four, we would even leave to the judgment of those who are most attached to our academical system, and who, like Mr. Perry and Professors Whewell and Sedgwick, most adorn it.

We are not unaware, that in offering these suggestions, we may be charged with exceeding the limits of our proper critical function, and presenting our own views to the reader, instead of those of the writers upon whom we profess to comment. From this charge we cannot altogether escape—but in extenuation, or rather in justification of the course which we have taken, we would plead a higher duty to our common mother, the Church. We have been placed in circumstances which have afforded us the means of observing closely, and we think accurately, what the Church has, what she has *not*, and what she *ought* to have—if she is to become in act and in operation what she is in name and profession, the NATIONAL CHURCH; the Church of Christ established not only *in*, but *throughout* the land—extending her schools wherever there are children to be instructed; erecting her sanctuaries and establishing her ministers, wherever there are sheep to be gathered into the fold and family of Christ. “How shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach, except they be sent”—and how shall they be sent, unless they have been themselves thoroughly instructed in the doctrines which they are delegated to expound, and deeply imbued with the principles which they are to inculcate and to recommend? How shall those teach who have not first learned Christ—how shall those “reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine,” who have not first “known the holy scriptures, which are able to make them wise into salvation?” An accomplished scholar may charm the ears, and an expert dialectician may convince the understandings of the hearers; but how can it be expected that a shallow and superficial theologian shall be able, by sound doctrine, either to refute and to convince the gainsayers, or to build up believers in our most holy faith? We know of no method more likely to elevate the standard of theological attainment *within* the universities, than the establishment of theological seminaries *without*—and if established with such precautions and under such patronage as we have ventured to suggest, we believe that they might be the instruments, under God, of averting from our Church that which is at once the most severe reproach, and the most perilous deficiency of any Christian community, when it can with truth be averred, that

“The hungry sheep look up, and are not fed.”

FOUR LECTURES ON SPIRITUAL CHRISTIANITY, *Delivered in the Hanover-square Rooms, London, March, 1841.*
By ISAAC TAYLOR. London: Jackson and Walford. 1841.

THIS short work of Mr. Taylor's has many of the excellences and defects of his larger productions. More unfinished and loose in its style, it has the same freshness of thought, the same vivid apprehension of the grand outlines of Christian truth, and the same tendency to fill up those outlines by ingenious touches of abstract speculation, instead of the large and living fulness of scriptural doctrine. When to these characters we have added a measure of ecclesiastical laxness on the one hand, and on the other, a refreshing tone of Christian benevolence, our view of Mr. Taylor's literary physiognomy will be generally acknowledged, we think, to be a correct likeness.

The object of these lectures is to exhibit the leading features of true Christianity, in contrast with that barren formalism, whether neological or superstitious, which usurps the name. The subject is of such deep and vital interest as may well demand our close and patient attention.

The first lecture is on the outward marks of Spiritual Christianity. Among these our Author selects four as the most important; first, that Christianity is a religion of facts—next that its facts are those in which all men, without exception, and in an equal degree, are personally concerned—thirdly, that it induces a new relation between man and his Maker—and lastly, that its facts, when received as true, are adapted to excite and maintain the most profound emotions of the soul.

Under the first of these we find some just remarks on the false notion that *moral* evidence is always far inferior to the mathematical or physical. We can only extract a few sentences:—

“If, for a moment, we grant an intelligible meaning to the objection as stated, and consent to understand the terms in which it is conveyed, as they are often used, then we affirm—that some portion of even the abstract sciences is less certain than are very many things established by what is called moral evidence—that a large amount of what is accredited as probably true within the circle of the physical and mixed sciences, is *immeasurably inferior* in certainty to much which rests upon moral evidence; and further, that so far from its being reasonable to reject this species of evidence, the mere circumstance of a man's being known to distrust it in the conduct of his daily affairs, would be held to justify, in his case, a commission of lunacy.”—(p. 31.)

“Every *real* transaction, especially those which flow on through a course of time, touches this web-work of small events at many points, and is woven into its very substance. Fiction may indeed paint its personages so as for a moment to deceive the eye; but it has never succeeded in the attempt to foist its factitious embroideries upon the tapestry of truth.

"We might take as an instance, that irresistible book in which Paley has established the truth of the personal history of St. Paul. It is throughout a tracing of the thousand fibres by which a long series of events connects itself with the warp and woof of human affairs. To apply to evidence of this sort, the besom of scepticism, and sweepingly to remove it, as consisting only in *moral evidence*, is an amazing instance of confusion of mind.

"It is often loosely affirmed, that history rests mainly upon moral evidence. Is then a Roman camp moral evidence? Or is a Roman road moral evidence? Or are these and many other facts, when appealed to as proof of the assertion that, in a remote age, the Romans held military occupation of Britain, moral evidence? If they be, then we affirm that, when complete in its kind, it falls not a whit behind mathematical demonstration, as to its certainty."—(pp. 33, 34.)

We could wish that our author had carried these remarks a few steps further. He would then, we think, have seen clearly—first, that the expression, *moral evidence*, as commonly used, is a gross misnomer, which may rival the 'new moral world' of Socialism; and secondly, that the true climax is from physical or historical evidence, through the mathematical to the moral. The lowest kind of proof, or the bare evidence of fact, may be abundantly strong; but the others, while nobler and higher in themselves, call higher powers into exercise before they can be attained. The evidence of geometrical truth is indeed superior to that of the senses; but the moral evidence of divine and spiritual truth to the enlightened conscience and the awakened heart, is still higher and more complete.

The following sentences are worthy of the serious attention of many well meaning, but careless advocates of Church and State in the present day:—

"If Christianity be historically true, it must be granted to demand more than a respectful acknowledgment, that its system of ethics is pure; or were it historically false, we ought to think ourselves to be outraging at once virtue and reason in allowing its name to pass our lips. While bowing to Christianity as good and useful, and yet not invested with authority toward ourselves, we are entangled in a web of inconsistencies, of which we are not conscious, only because we choose to make no effort to break through it. If Christianity be true, then is it true that 'we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ;' and must, 'every one of us, give an account of himself to God.' What meaning do such words convey to the minds of those who, with an equal alarm, would see Christianity overthrown as a controlling power in the social system; or find it brought home to themselves, as an authority they must personally bow to? Christians! how many amongst us are *Christians*, as men might be called philosophers, who, while naming Newton always with admiration, should yet reserve their interior assent for the very paganism of astronomy."—(pp. 35, 36.)

But we pass to the second topic of the lecture; and here, we think, our author errs by over-statement, as is often the case with zealous antagonists of error. That all are most deeply concerned in the great facts of the gospel is true, but is it needful to add, in an equal degree? In the presence of the Infinite, of what account, Mr. Taylor asks, are the differences of the finite? We

answer, of very great account, the gospel itself being our witness. The difference between the righteous and the wicked, the believer and the unbeliever, is a difference of the finite, and yet is it one of vast moment in the sight of God himself. But apart from this grand distinction, when we recollect the divine statements, that "to whom much is given, of them much will be required;" that in the resurrection, "star differeth from star in glory;" and that he "which knew his Lord's will and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes;" we dare not assert, even for the purpose of abating the false pretensions of spiritual caste, that all men are equally concerned in the momentous truths of the gospel. Their vast importance to every child of man is quite consistent with the deeper responsibility of those who enjoy peculiar privileges, or whose calling is to minister in holy things. If Mr. Taylor, instead of trusting to his own abstract reasonings, would study the divinely appointed sin-offerings of the law, he would be led, we think, to modify his unguarded statement; while the change, far from weakening, would only strengthen the force of his main argument.

Under the third head of the lecture, the new relation induced by the gospel, we have some beautiful and impressive remarks on the filial spirit of Christian piety. We cannot refrain from a longer extract:—

"Is, then, God our Father? The gospel declares it, as a fundamental truth; and in opening up, by instances, the import of this declaration, it shows that this language of sacred affection is to be understood, not in a sense lowered and vague, as compared with that which it bears in its ordinary acceptation, but in a sense of incalculably greater intensity and depth.

"Genuine piety commences at the moment when the love of our heavenly Father towards ourselves individually, as his children, is distinctly recognised. The earliest movements of the new life of the soul take this very character. 'As many as are led by the Spirit of God,' they are taught that they are 'the sons of God,' and find that they have not received 'the spirit of bondage again, to fear,' but 'the spirit of adoption,' whereby they invoke God as their Father; 'the Spirit itself bearing witness with their spirits, that they are the children of God.'

"It is this filial sentiment—the peculiarity of Christian piety—which brightens the enjoyments of life, even the most common of them, with a sense that, in our obscure homes, we are sitting, from day to day, at the board which our heavenly Father has spread. It is this feeling which mitigates and sanctifies affliction; wherein, even when the sharpest, we discern a token of the truth that God is 'dealing with us as with sons,' and is in fact preparing us for our home. It is this same affection—the distinct filial sentiment, which dispels the terrors of death; while the Christian believes that the Father of spirits is removing a member of his family from a less to a more desirable abode.

"If Christian principles be thoroughly admitted, the Christian's home, even under these inclement skies, differs but in circumstance from the mansion preparing for him above. 'If a man love me,' said Jesus to his disciples, 'he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and will make our abode with him.'

"The intimate and affectionate relationship opened between the individual

Christian and his heavenly Father, finds its field of exercise in two principles very decisively pronounced in the inspired writings, as well of the Old as of the New Testament—we mean the doctrine of a particular providence, and that of the proper efficacy of prayer, in relation to the ordinary events of life. It is easy to see in what manner a cordial belief of these principles tends to give vivacity and intensity to the religious affections; for it is thus that the very same world of cares, fears, hopes, which tends to obliterate the moral sentiments of other men, becomes, to the affectionate Christian, an efficacious discipline of faith and love.”—(pp. 48—50.)

“Previously, therefore, to any inquiry as to the truths peculiar to Christianity, this intimate and affectionate relationship established between man and his Maker, as reconciled through Christ, presents itself to our notice, and should be regarded as a prominent feature of the Christian system.

“Will it be said that our Lord, or his apostles, give encouragement, in any way, to an unhallowed familiarity in our approaches to God, or that the reverence due to the Infinite Majesty is infringed by them? Certainly not. The contrary is most evident. We see, then, that, according to the *idea* of the Christian system, the deepest reverence is still compatible with an affectionate and filial confidence, involving the belief that the individual Christian is the object of a paternal regard.

“On what scheme this adjustment of reverence and affection may be accomplished is an after question. We now merely state the fact, and appeal to it as a most striking proof, at once of the spirituality, and of the benign tendency of the gospel, and of its immeasurable superiority to every other religious system, whether contemplative or superstitious.

“Within the entire range of antiquity we meet with absolutely nothing that approaches this characteristic Christian feeling, except indeed what we find in the Old Testament, and especially the Psalms. And as to the several perversions of Christianity, from the first century to the present time, they stand condemned, one and all, by this very test, if by no other.

“So far as such systems have leaned toward intellectuality and abstraction, they have in the same degree excluded the warmth and simplicity of Christian piety. While such as have been marked by a tendency to superstition have, as uniformly, and as completely, removed the worshipper to a distance, where dread and anxiety must prevail over every happier sentiment. Or if, under any such systems, the fanatic has broken through these restraints, he has drawn near to the throne, not with calm filial affection, but with the effrontery of an evil spirit.”—(pp. 54, 55.)

It is this spirit of child-like adoption, this “confidence and rejoicing of hope,” as the apostle speaks, which renders the true Christian an enigma to men of the world. Their religion is one of distance and dread, of constraint and bondage. They would not only reserve the Atonement from others, they reserve it from themselves; and it seems to them an intolerable presumption, that a sinful creature should find gladness and joy in the presence of the Holy One of Israel. But it is not less true that there is a danger on the other side. In our judgment, perhaps erroneous, but still our deliberate judgment,—reverence is the element most painfully wanting in the religion of the present day. When the glory of the everlasting gospel, the mystery hid from ages and generations, sinks into an “evangelical school,” there is evident danger lest the streams of heavenly truth should be sand-choked, and the power of godliness be lost in the form. The Christian ought indeed

always to rejoice, but the caution is now more than ever needed, to "rejoice with reverence." And we are persuaded that the want of this spirit among true Christians has been one main inlet to the portentous revival of formalism in our own Church.

The second lecture is on the truths peculiar to spiritual Christianity. And here Mr. Taylor makes a just distinction between truths pre-supposed in the Christian revelation, and which it only enunciates with greater clearness; and those which form its nature and peculiar essence. Of the first class he instances two of the most obnoxious in the following eloquent paragraphs:—

"Such is the belief, with all its appalling consequences, that the human race has fallen under the usurped sway of an invisible and malignant power—the ancient enemy of God—the outlaw of heaven, the author of error;—first the seducer, and then the tormentor of his victims.

"A dark belief indeed is this! but we gain very little by rejecting it, so long as the human family remains as far from virtue as from happiness, nor indicating any tendency to a return. So long as superstitions the most frightful, with their unmitigated horrors, continue to press, age after age, upon the larger portion of mankind, we do but shift a difficulty, not remove it, by denying the agency of an invisible enemy.

"This belief, whispered in all nations, is uttered aloud wherever superstition has long ruled without a check. In half civilized and savage countries the infernal agency flares upon our sight; and, if we would be thoroughly equitable, ought we not to acknowledge, that, in civilized countries, indications to the same effect are not ambiguous. May it not be more than surmised, that the author of mischief, who walks abroad with noisy pomp in pagan lands, keeps house among ourselves, and goes softly?

"Is it affirmed to be a blasphemy to suppose that there can be a Satan within the bounds of God's universe? Alas! how many Tamerlanes, in ancient and in modern times, have shown us that we are not at liberty to reason in this manner! 'The beauty and beneficent intention of creation,' it is said, 'rebuks the dogma of a personal evil principle.' But we ask, Why there may not be a Satan, if there be on earth tyrant tormentors, malignant calumniators, and avowed enemies of peace, order, and purity? 'Beneath the fair vault of heaven,' you say, 'there can be no agent of misery, or no sphere for his malice, if there were one.' Look between decks of a slave ship, and tell us why there may not be a Satan. Alas! the darkest surmises of superstition have been only exaggerations of the things of earth! And the horrid descriptions which deform the Koran are but wild dreams of things which have been actually transacted on earth! When we go about ingeniously to trace the origin of the belief in an infernal world, to the horrors of eastern despotism, what do we but exhibit incontestible proofs that, notwithstanding the goodness of God, such a world may be?

"Under the very same conditions stands the doctrine of future punishment. The Saviour of the world vouches for the truth of this—the instinctive belief of the human race. He speaks of the 'wrath to come,' and solemnly warns us to escape from it. But is he therefore our enemy? or is Christianity to be blamed on this account? First let us be sure that the alarm it gives is groundless; for if it be well founded, assuredly the gospel is 'good news.' That sort of infatuation which impels us to vent upon an innocent messenger our vexation on hearing ill tidings, attaches to us when we resent the gospel, because it involves the belief of the terrible retributions of the future world."—(pp. 72—74.)

It is indeed, to the enlightened heart, a most powerful evidence

of the truth of Christianity, that while every false religion provides opiates for the conscience, and veils for the eyes, to hide from man the knowledge of his true danger; the gospel, in the triumphant calmness of its own all-sufficient remedy, does not shrink from revealing the utmost power and terrors of the kingdom of darkness. This moral boldness, which is a stumbling-block to the sceptic, to every heart that can think or feel deeply, presents one of the clearest proofs that it is truly divine.

The truths which our author singles out, as most descriptive of true Christianity, though resting themselves on the anterior basis of an orthodox creed—are justification by faith; sanctification by the Holy Spirit; and the fruit of these when heartily embraced, peace and joy in believing, as the spring of holy tempers, and practical obedience and love. His statement is prefaced by some remarks on the powerlessness of a barren orthodoxy, which seem to call for a passing notice:—

“Orthodoxy, very early severed from evangelic truth, showed at once what was its quality, when so divorced. Some time before the breaking out of the Trinitarian controversy, a discipline and course of life directly contravening the first principle of the gospel, had received the almost unanimous homage of the Church throughout the world, and was applauded on all sides as the highest style of Christian piety.

“What moral influence was orthodoxy likely to exert, when it fell into the hands of those who had overlooked, or who virtually denied, the truths which alone can bring it home to the heart? The Saviour, forgotten as ‘the end of the law, for righteousness, to every one that believeth,’ was soon forgotten also as the ‘one Mediator between God and man.’ Most instructive is the fact, that at the very moment when Trinitarian doctrine was the most hotly contended for, and punctiliously professed; mediators many, and gods many, and goddesses many, were receiving, under the auspices, and by the encouragement of the great preachers, theologians, and bishops of the time, the fervent devotions of the multitude! It was to these potent intercessors that sincere petitions were addressed; while to the Trinity was offered—a doxology! Whenever men were in real trouble, and when they needed and heartily desired help from above, they sought it, where they believed they should the soonest find it—at the shrines of the martyrs, or of the Virgin. No fact of church history carries a heavier lesson than that which we gather when, listening to the perorations of the great preachers of the age of orthodoxy, we hear them, first invoking, with animation, and high-sounding phrases, a saint in the heavens, while the finger pointed to his glittering shrine: and then ascribing ‘honour and glory’ to the Trinity!

“Orthodoxy by itself does not touch the conscience; does not quicken the affections; it does not connect itself, in any manner, with the moral faculties. It is not a religion, but a theory; and inasmuch as it awakens no spiritual feelings, it consists easily with either the grossest absurdities, or with the grossest corruptions.

“Orthodoxy, powerless when alone, becomes even efficient for evil at the moment when it combines itself with asceticism, superstition, and hierarchical ambition. What is the religious history of Europe, through a long course of time, but a narrative of the horrors and the immoralities that have sprung from this very combination?

“Heterodoxy, which has long been the temptation of the continental Protestant churches, has at length wrought their ruin; or, at the best, has left

them in an expiring condition. But in perfect equity must it not be acknowledged, that orthodoxy, severed from evangelic truth, has been the temptation of England; and that, at this moment, by reviving its ancient connection with superstition, it gives just alarm to the true sons of the reformers? Those great men—the lights of the sixteenth century—whom we do not worship, but whose steps we would follow, were orthodox, and yet they were no monks: they were Trinitarians, but they were not idolaters: they had studied the Fathers, but they bowed to the Scriptures; and from the Scriptures they recovered evangelic truth—ineestimable treasure—which so many around us are now ready to exchange for the ‘vainly-invented’ superstitions of antiquity!”—(pp. 76—78.)

Now in much that is here stated we cordially agree, as most reasonable and important truth. But still there is something defective in the tone of this passage, and which the Christian of tender conscience would hesitate to adopt fully as the just expression of his feelings. In the first place, there seems no warrant for this artificial restriction of the term orthodoxy to a notional reception of the doctrine of the Trinity alone. The common use of the word, it is true, is exceedingly vague, but we see no cause for affixing the stamp of a deliberate approbation to a definition so palpably erroneous.

But conceding the term, and admitting further that great corruptions early began to infest the Church, even under the cover of a Trinitarian profession,—is the author warranted in making such statements as the above passage contains? Is it consistent, either with reason, or with the facts of history, or the declarations of inspired prophecy, to maintain, as he does elsewhere, and implies even here,—that the Nicene ages were equally corrupt, and perhaps even more so, than the Romish Church of later times? From such a view we entirely dissent, and on the strongest grounds. Again, with regard to the ascetic perversions on which he dilates, are we quite sure that our author, or this generation of the Church at large, are in the exact point of sight to view the subject without bias or distortion? In an age so fertile as our own in French dissoluteness and profligacy, Irish pauperism and violence, infant slavery, opium-warfare, and the feverish energy of selfish speculation, are we sure that even the sounder parts of the Church have so entirely escaped the infection of sensual indulgence and the intense contagion of worldliness, as to be fitted to pass an impartial condemnation on the ascetic tendencies of earlier times? We suspect that in the day of supreme decision the balance of truth and error in doctrine, of right and wrong in practice, between the primitive and the Protestant Churches, will be found to be far smaller than our author seems to suppose. Could the Church of the present day learn to combine their contrasted aspects of truth and holiness, casting aside the chaff of self-righteous pride, or self-indulgent

presumption, which adheres to either, we should then behold a state of doctrine and practice, more glorious than has ever been witnessed on earth since the apostolic times.

But Mr. Taylor thinks that "orthodoxy becomes even efficient for evil, when it combines with asceticism and hierarchical ambition." Now this seems to us as rash and unfounded, as to assert that the love of God becomes efficient for evil, when combined with obduracy and unbelief. If the seeds of truth be scattered on the wayside of the heart, while the weeds of error are welcomed in the soil and shoot up into vigorous growth, does the good seed therefore change its nature and become "efficient for evil?" Such statements appear to us deceptive and groundless, and repugnant to the spiritual tenderness of a conscience that trembles at the Divine word, and reverences the great mystery of godliness.

But we turn to a passage more fully congenial to our own feelings, as we trust it will be to those of our readers. The author is repelling the charge of trifling with sacred things, brought so often against all who deny the inseparable connexion of outward baptism and spiritual regeneration; and returns it upon the head of those who excommunicate churches, by wholesale, from the body of Christ, for irregularities of discipline, or defects of order. The passage deserves to be pondered deeply by those Churchmen who declaim loudly and justly against the sin of schism, lest they should prove guilty of it themselves in its most aggravated and grievous form:—

"But it is not we who trifle with things sacred, or even with the symbols of such things; and we appeal to the fact, that wherever spiritual Christianity most flourishes, there the genuine ordinances of Christ are the most reverently and affectionately regarded.

"Yet again—we hold nothing on earth to be more sacred, than is the work of the Holy Spirit, when clearly manifested in the temper and unblameable conduct of Christian men. If there be any instances in which the reality of religion comes home to our convictions with irresistible force, it is when we converse with those who themselves hold much communion with God. As the Agent is most sacred, so is his work; nor can there be, as we think, an impiety more bold than that of those who, after distinctly contemplating the work of the Spirit of God, indubitably displayed in the walk and heavenly dispositions of Christian men, dare to scout it as altogether factitious, because, forsooth, the Christianity of these seeming Christians is open to the suspicion of having reached them through some indirect channel! Thus to walk forth amid the most precious of the works of God, trampling without remorse upon whatever does not happen to lie within a certain ecclesiastical border, must be held to indicate—is it the highest moral courage? or not rather, a temper most irreligious, as well as arrogant.

"This is, indeed, to trifle with things sacred; and the more so when it is remembered that the prevalence of so intolerant a theory, and the bold avowal of it by those who are regarded as the best-informed expounders of Christianity, silently but extensively operates to drive cultured and ingenuous minds into deism or atheism. What is this Christianity, say such, which, while professing to be a religion, not of bondage and forms, but of

truth and love, nevertheless impels its adherents to violate all charity on the precarious ground of an elaborate hypothesis!

“It is unavoidable thus pointedly to advert to these now prevalent errors, because, in the practical interpretation given them, they are absolutely incompatible with an adherence to spiritual Christianity. Those who are sternly enjoined, on peril of their own salvation, not to recognise as Christian brethren any whose ecclesiastical legitimacy may be ambiguous, are, of necessity, driven to adopt such a notion of Christian piety as may consist with the application of this ecclesiastical rule. In plain words, they must learn to scout as futile or illusory, whatever is *moral* and *spiritual* in religion; while they fix their attention exclusively upon that which is formal and adjunctive. Nor will those who are taught to judge of others in this manner, be slow to judge of themselves, on the same principle. ‘If we be Christians *ecclesiastically*, it is enough: all besides is illusion.’

“And such in fact are every day seen to be the products of the ecclesiastical theory which we denounce as, at this time, the antagonist of Spiritual Christianity. In its recent revival it has shed a cold arrogance into many bosoms that once glowed with Christian affection; and at the same time, it has drawn such aside (in how many sad instances!) from an enlightened regard to the substantial truths of the gospel; while they give all their cares to frivolous and servile observances.

“But we turn to a happier theme. Happy indeed, and ennobling, as well as efficacious, is the belief, that He ‘from whom all holy desires, good counsels, and just works do proceed,’ dwelleth in us, as the author of spiritual life! In a word, that the body of the Christian is ‘the temple of the Holy Ghost.’ A doctrine this, which, if scripturally held, precludes at once despondency and presumption. For how should we despond, if He who ‘creates us anew in Christ Jesus,’ is almighty? or how presume, if we be convinced that, were the sacred energy withdrawn, there ‘would remain in us no good thing?’—(pp. 98—101.)

We must pass by the third lecture, on the Ethical Features of Christianity, and can only indulge ourselves with one further extract from the fourth—“Spiritual Christianity the hope of the World at the present moment.” The inefficacy of civilization alone; the high office open, in God’s providence, to our own country; and the great impelling truths, which should stir the zeal and quicken the efforts of British Christians, are pointed out with much eloquence and power:—

“Mere civilization is too likely to ally herself to that atheistic and sensual philosophy which comports so well with the temper and aims of a commercial people. We mean the philosophy which regards man simply as one of the mammalia, and as distinguished from others of his order only by a loftier facial angle, by some ounces more of the cerebral mass, by the jointing of his thumb, and by the possession of a heel-bone. But how is such a union—such a *conspiracy*—to be deprecated? Too soon might busy civilization, bent on gain, take animal philosophy into her establishment, as the most compliant and serviceable of her creatures; and this shrewd minion, teaching her mistress to blush at no well-calculated and undoubtedly profitable cruelty, would undertake to prove, that those who draw prizes in the lottery of life are unwise, if they spoil their peace by any compunctious sympathies toward the less fortunate millions of the species.

“If we imagine all Christian feeling and Christian truth to be withdrawn, the present is a time of high intensity indeed in the social system, but of very low moral temperature; nor can we confide in any disposition which is the

proper growth of such a time, as *an impulse of benevolence*, or as affording any ground of hope for the melioration of the lot of man.

"But we turn to the second of those subjects which we mentioned as incidental to our argument. This is the altogether peculiar position which we, the people of England, at this passing moment occupy, in relation to the human family. Has not the part of an elder brother of this great family actually fallen upon the English race? and have not the solitudes of such a relationship actually become ours? Are we not by many interests, and by motives higher than any interests, compelled, in some measure, nay to a great extent, to think for all, to care for all, to defend the weak, to forefend the strong; and is there not now pervading the people of this country, even as a temper which has become characteristically British, a kindly sympathy in what affects the welfare of each race of the human family; such a feeling, at least, as has never belonged to any other people in any age? If many partake not at all of any such feeling, they are fewer than those who are alive to it in a good degree.

"With all the paths of the world now mapped before us, and with means of communication which, for practical ends, condense the population of the earth, as if the thousand millions were crowded upon a ball of one third the diameter; and with actual colonial possession of a large portion of the earth; and with moral possession, by high character and repute, of almost the whole of it; and with all these uncalculated and untried means of influence now ripened, and presented afresh to our hands, who is it that can altogether control those mingling emotions of patriotism and of expansive benevolence, which become us, occupying as we do a position, whence we may go forth to conquer the world, not for ambition, not for wealth, but for Truth and Peace!

"And as we do stand in this position, and as we do, in so great a measure, entertain the feelings proper to it; so is there a reciprocity of feeling widely diffused among the nations.—British *political* influence or natural supremacy apart, the British feeling—its honour, its justice, and its humanity, are in fact understood in the remotest regions, and are trusted to by tribes whose names we have not yet learned to pronounce. The several designations by which English benevolence, in its various forms, styles itself, have, as watch-words of hope, traversed the ocean, and have pervaded wildernesses; and these titles of our organized philanthropy have already awakened the dull ear of half civilized continents, and are reverberated from the hill-sides of the remotest barbarism.

"It is true that England is looked to, as the helper, guardian, guide of the nations. And assuredly it is the CHRISTIANITY of England which gives depth, substance, life, to her repute through the world, as the lover of justice, and the mover of good."—(pp. 158—160.)

"What we need, then, for the renovation of the human family is—the spread of that life-giving doctrine which we find in the Scriptures, and which challenges the abject and the wretched, universally, and unexceptively, as the heirs of immortality, and as individually embraced in the intention of the gospel.

"It follows from this doctrine that men, even the vilest, are no more to be condemned;—for the Almighty does not condemn them:—they are no longer to be forgotten, or despotically abused, or selfishly despaired of; for the Son of God has redeemed them. On the contrary; they must now singly, and at whatever cost, be sought out, instructed, cared for, and succoured.

"We ask only that a doctrine such as this should be heartily embraced by Christian nations, and should be carried out wherever such nations are coming in contact with barbarous and semi-barbarous races: must it not become a mighty energy, tending, directly and certainly, to the renovation of the world?"—(p. 163.)

We fear that the description of the feelings with which England is

regarded is too highly coloured, and that the accuser of the brethren, if permitted to plead against our country, would find, in our policy towards the heathen world, many counter-pleas of fearful weight to present in the courts of heaven. Nor do we believe that the word of God warrants us in looking to such means alone, as are here mentioned, for the consummated triumph of the world's redemption. Much as we love our country, and rejoice in the great work which God has set before it, it is not to England but to Palestine, not to London but to Zion, the mountain of God's holiness, that we must look, as the earthly centre of our hopes, and the springhead from which blessings shall flow forth upon a long apostate, but ransomed world. But the duty of British Christians is abundantly clear, nor is the encouragement small which the providence of God has afforded them, in the political grandeur and wide-spread commerce of our country, for the prosecution of this great and holy work. Let them cheerfully and gladly consecrate their substance, their prayers, and their labours, to this divine and heavenly warfare against heathen darkness, and an abundant first-fruits of success will be given them even now, and a reward of pure and unspeakable joy in the day when their Lord will reap the full harvest of blessing.

ST. ANTHOLIN'S; *or, Old Churches and New. A Tale for the Times.* By FRANCIS E. PAGET, M.A., Rector of Elford, and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. London: *Burns*. 1841.

WHETHER, in the "movement now making in defence of the Church and her principles," the novelist department has been assigned to Mr. Paget, as that of mysticism to Mr. Newman, and of ethics to Professor Sewell—or whether his lively narratives, entitled "*Tales of the Village*," are voluntary contributions to a common cause, we will not take upon us to determine. Certainly, the companionship in which his novellettes appear, would incline us to the first of these suppositions; nor should we be less disposed to arrive at this conclusion, after the perusal of the present work, which is levelled, not at his former windmill antagonist, Ultra-Protestantism, but at what Mr. Paget, we suppose, would term one of its consequences—the practice of building lath-and-plaster churches. In order therefore to counteract the mania for erecting "preaching-

houses " instead of cathedrals ; placing the pulpit in a position where the preacher can be seen as well as heard ; and accommodating a few hundreds more of immortal and responsible hearers by means of galleries, he has indited this "Tale for the Times." And a very lively and amusing tale it is, though designed, he tells us, to inculcate an unwelcome truth, by leading men to admit certain premises before they are aware that the conclusions apply to themselves. Even with this premonition, however, and knowing what we are to expect, we will nevertheless venture to accompany Mr. Paget : and one thing we can assure him at the commencement, that whatever we may think of his *premises*, we should be well contented, whether as Church-builders or Church-restorers, to arrive at his *conclusion*.

The parish of Tadbrook, St. Antholin, possessed an antique, substantial, cathedral-looking Church, a little the worse for wear, and a popular churchwarden, who never called for more than a half-penny rate ; whitewashed the Church once in seven years, and the surplice twice in twelve months. The old archdeacon, however, who had been for many years a very indifferent "eye" to the bishop, dies at last ; and another is appointed, rejoicing in the appropriate cognomen of Dr. Sharpe, who loses no time in proving his title to the name. To the utter astonishment of Mr. Churchwarden Ouzel, and at the imminent hazard of his own neck, the new dignitary makes his way up a crazy ladder and through a cloud of jackdaws' nests into the belfry, where he finds the bells mute, the beams mouldering into touchwood, and the steeple considerably out of the perpendicular. The Archdeacon orders repairs ; the churchwarden by postponement and quibbling contrives to evade a Church-rate, and thus gives name to Chapter I., which is "*How to please everybody*." But the best churchwardens are mortal—"Muster Ouzel" dies, and so does the rector ; a new incumbent succeeds, who nominates a new churchwarden, and the parish on their part elect Mr. Walter Tyler, the cornfactor ; the rector and his churchwarden desire to set about the repairs ordered by the archdeacon, but Wat Tyler objects, until a piece of plaister, falling on his head during divine service, threatens him with the fate of Abimelech. He then concurs with the others in obtaining an estimate for repairs from Mr. Scantlings, the builder, which amounts to the sum of £700 (rather more than double the sum which would have sufficed in the first instance) and a vestry is called to receive the estimate and make a rate for the repairs. This forms the title of Chapter II., "*How to please nobody*." The proceedings of the vestry are described in Mr. Paget's liveliest manner, and interspersed with several of his best jokes—and

having ourselves witnessed scenes not very dissimilar, we can better vouch for the fidelity of the representation, which is worthy of Charles Dickens himself:—

“ ‘I think the fairest thing would be that everybody should repair that part of the roof which is over his own seat,’ observed a rate-payer who had a very small pew.

“ ‘For my part,’ said another, ‘I don’t see that things are worse than they were a year ago.’ Mr. Tyler shook his head, for he thought of the plaster. ‘At any rate, I think the roof or the walls, or whatever is amiss, might be shored up, so as to make all safe for a while longer.’

“ ‘I fear,’ said Mr. Sanderson, who sat patiently listening to all this nonsense, in the hope that it would bring its own condemnation with it in the minds of the more respectable part of his parishioners, who were sitting silent and undecided: ‘I fear that all these suggestions will only palliate the evil, not remove it:’ and then, feeling that he had to deal with persons who (alas! for the low, cold, covetous temper of the age!) could only be worked upon by pecuniary considerations, he added, ‘there is one point which you will do well to consider: the repairs will *now* cost £700; if experience is to be our guide in such matters, a few years hence (if the edifice stands so long) the expense may increase to £1,400 or £1,500.’

“ ‘Aye, but it will last *our* time, I reckon, and the young uns may look arter themselves,’ said Cobbler Tapps, with a wink and a shrug which he intended should be very convincing. ‘By your leave, gentlemen, I’ll tell you how it is. I am a man, gentlemen, that don’t nowadays like to part with my money without just cause and impediment; and so as I am a rate-payer, I should just like to ax a question or two. Pray, Mr. Churchwarden Andrewes, what business has that Dr. Sharpe to come here meddling about our church? If it hadn’t been for him, nobody would ha’ seed that there war anything amiss in it.’

“ ‘Why, Tapps, you know well enough: he’s the archdeacon: and it is his business to see that all parts of the church are in repair—walls, windows, pillars, arches, and so forth.’

“ ‘Oh, that’s the reason, is it, that he’s called an *archdeacon*? Well, but suppose he orders one thing, and we do another?’

“ ‘Why then, Tapps, he may bring us into all manner of trouble.’

“ ‘Bring a fool’s head into trouble,’ cried Tapps, growing eloquent. ‘I’ll tell you how it is, gentlemen; if poor Muster Ouzel warn’t in his grave we shouldn’t have heard nothing of all this rigmarole. To be sure, by all accounts, he gave your archdeacon as good as he brought: he know’d his business, and warn’t going to let poor folks be imposed upon. Yes, gentlemen, he was a good man—and a great man, gentlemen—worthy to be admired, gentlemen; and imitated, gentlemen: and I wish with all my heart we had a spice of his equanimity and jurisprudence. Sure, gentlemen, if there is one thing more than another which is the birthright of Englishmen, it is civil and religious liberty. See how that there man tramples on our rights! Pretty *religious* liberty we should have if we can’t do what we will with our own church! and for *civil*, I’m sure there’s as little civility as need be, on *his* part, at least! And so, gentlemen, I shall move that we put off receiving them there estimates for six months, in order to give us time to look about us, and see if we can’t agree among ourselves what’s best to be done, without archdeacons or any such cattle—no offence to his reverence, Mr. Sanderson. Crabley, will you second me?’

“ Crabley (the only dissenter in the parish, and a rate-payer to the amount of twopence halfpenny per annum) nodded.

“ ‘Gentlemen, I move this meeting be adjourned from this present day, the 7th of January, 1839, to the 7th of July next.’

“ It was evident that the wealthier rate-payers, who had taken no part in

the preceding discussion, were not sorry to have the odium of originating such a proposition shifted from their own shoulders; but they were not ashamed to support it. One or two murmurs of assent were followed by a general expression of opinion, that after all there would be no harm in a little delay—that Tapps had made a very fair suggestion; and that it was better to have a little time to look about them, and not take a leap in the dark.

“The question was then put by Mr. Sanderson, and, to his no small regret, was carried by an overwhelming majority; in fact, Churchwarden Andrewes and himself were the only persons to vote against it. Mr. Walter Tyler was neutral.”—(pp. 28—31.)

Mr. Paget's knowledge of ecclesiastical law or, at least, of the custom of parochial vestries seems, however, to have failed him here. We wonder it should never have occurred to him that the rector, being in the chair, could vote neither against the motion nor for it, unless the numbers were equal—while yet, as he tells us, here was “an overwhelming majority against the rate.”

Chapter III. entitled, “*Who would have thought it,*” may be speedily dispatched. On the evening of the day of the vestry meeting, while Tapps, exulting in his success, is drinking himself drunk at the Leg of Mutton, a storm comes on, which beats down first “the old oak tree on the left of the hatch gate,” then a huge stone from the Church spire, then the weathercock with some twenty tons of stone, and lastly the spire itself. The description of this final catastrophe, as compared with the former extract, displays Mr. Paget's powers as a writer in an equally striking and more favourable point of view:—

“But this was only the prelude to a yet more terrific sight. Whether from the still increasing fury of the tempest, or the damage caused to the lower portion of the dilapidated building by the fall of the upper part of the spire, was never known; but as the blast swept by once more, the whole body of the steeple from base to crown was seen to shake and totter—to reel and stagger like a drunken man, and then slowly inclining to the south-east, fell in a slanting direction across the whole length of the church, and with the roar, as it seemed, of a hundred cannon, carried downwards in its descent, not the roof only, but a large portion of the southern and eastern walls of the church, which stood uninjured for a moment, and then crumbled, as it were, outwards, and so came to the ground.

“A thick cloud of smoke-like dust rose from the ruins; but ere a minute had elapsed the wind drifted it away, and the distant echoes of the catastrophe were drowned in the noise of the tempest, which seemed to howl and moan with rage and shame for the devastation it had caused.”—(pp. 52, 53.)

Chapter IV. is appropriately entitled, “*What's to be done now?*” There was no need to summon another vestry, for the whole parish had flocked spontaneously to the scene of desolation, except Tapps, the mover of the previous evening, who was drowning his vexation at the Leg of Mutton, and Wat Tyler, who was afraid of sharing the storm of reproach which was now showered without compunction on the memory of that best of churchwardens, Mr. Oliver

Ouzel. A new Church must be built, that was quite evident ; but where were the funds to come from ? Scantlings, who had now become a Sir Oracle among the multitude, considered that not less than £1500 would be required to restore the Church, even upon the most economical plan, and recommended the parish to borrow this sum upon the credit of the Church-rates—if they could find any body to lend it to them. They resolved, however, to try first what could be done by subscription—but receiving from the Diocesan Society, to which they first applied, not a remittance but a reproof—and this being backed by several stinging letters from the neighbouring nobility and gentry, alleviated only by one “promise to consider of it,” and one subscription of “half a sovereign,” their only resource was to apply to Mrs. Clutterbuck, the lady of Major *ditto*, who occupied the best pew in the old church, and was the busiest charity-monger in the parish. This lady, who managed every thing within the house, and most things out of it, engaged for her lord and master that he should lend £1000 for five years on the credit of the rates, and suggested the raising of the remainder by a bazaar, to be held in the national school-room during the Snobbington race week, to which Miss Selina Clutterbuck proposed to add a shilling subscription. Mr. Paget describes so humorously the mode of getting up the bazaar, that we could almost suspect him of having been behind the scenes at a ladies’ coterie :—

“ ‘ But who shall we get to have stalls ? ’ asked Selina Clutterbuck.

“ ‘ Why, let me see : Emma Johnson and her sister are fine-looking girls, and don’t mind being stared at—they are used to this sort of thing, so they would do :—and Lady Underwood (to be sure she’s quite a stick, but then Sir Ralph is county member, and it would sound well)—yes, Lady Underwood would do for another : and Mrs. Brassington (there must be somebody to talk and laugh with the men) and . . . and . . . but, in short, I don’t see any difficulty on that score. And we can all work bags and footstools—(Miss Mildways, you really must contribute a footstool)—and we must get Charlotte Smee to compose a song for us, and Rosa Smudge to do us some drawings.’ ”—(p. 70.)

Mr. Sanderson objects to the bazaar *in toto*, very much to the satisfaction of an old lady present, Miss Mildways, the sister of the late rector, who promises £25 if the subscription is unlimited, and £25 more, if there is no bazaar ; and the chapter closes with a hint from the rector, that “ a few less pier-glasses,” (we suppose the author means a reduction in their number, though his words express rather a diminution in size) “ the absence of a single picture (and surely such things as these are superfluous) would put hundreds at the disposal of many who speak as though they had not a guinea to spare.” And Mr. Sanderson’s eye wandered unconsciously over the beautiful furniture before him, but his uncon-

sciousness was not shared by Mrs. Major C., "Well really, sir, this beats every thing I ever heard of! Strip the walls—sell the pictures! and clothe ourselves in linsey wolsey! *Superfluities indeed!*"

Chapter V. is entitled, "*How to do it cheap.*" Cheapness, indeed, is become more than ever desirable, for the bazaar, owing to the counter-attraction of a Signior Salamandro, the original Babylonian conjuror, professor of legerdemain to the King of Persia and the Sublime Porte, turns out a complete failure, and the silver subscription realizes just £20. But accommodation was only required for 800 persons, and if churches were done for thirty-shillings per sitting in Lancashire, why not at Tadbrook? The plan of Scantlings therefore, which bore some resemblance to the original edifice, and provided, at Mr. Sanderson's suggestion, for the gradual restoration of it, was thrown aside, and a new architect invited from London in the person of Mr. Compo, a professor of cheap modern gothic, and a genius who had already immortalized himself by designing a cruet stand for Lord Mobgrub, a newly created peer. Mr. Compo hits off a plan for St. Antholin's, a fine specimen of gothic run to seed, "an elongated tower, with a neat little spire springing from very handsome battlements just able to carry a weathercock, and below the battlements a large belfry window, below the window a small circle with a clock face (the clock to be got hereafter), and underneath the clock comes the door, encircled with an ogee canopy, and ornamented with crockets and a finial." Miss Caroline Clutterbuck pronounces the design "sweetly pretty;" Mr. Sanderson, who holds the very opposite opinion, contrives by a vehement effort, to master his indignation for a time: the interior arrangements are indeed a bitter pill, but he gulps the galleries, swallows down the pulpit, and even stomachs one of Stynx and Kindleflintz' fifty-shilling stoves, "the smoke to be carried under the floor of the pews, up one of the cast iron pillars that support the gallery, and so out through the roof at the top of the gable, where," says the ingenious architect, "we can fix a little cast-iron pinnacle, perforated on all sides to let out the smoke, or if you like a cross made hollow for the same purpose—it would look very neat, only many persons object to crosses as being popish." The rector, however, did not object to the cross on this account—his assumed philosophy was destined to be overthrown by a cause very different from any excess of popishness. It occurred to him that there was no place marked for the font:—

"'Font!' cried Mr. Compo, when a reference was made to him on the subject:—'Surely, sir, you would not have had any space lost by the introduction of one of those great, ugly, cumbersome stone fonts, which you see

in the old churches? It would have occupied the room of three or four sittings. Besides, they are things which are obsolete now—quite gone out of fashion.'

" 'I crave pardon for my ignorance,' said Mr. Sanderson; 'fonts then are no longer necessary? I suppose that registration is to supersede the sacrament of baptism. In good sooth, the march of intellect is advancing in double quick time.'

" 'You have misunderstood me, sir,' replied the architect: 'I did not mean that Tadbrook should be without a font; but *stone* fonts are expensive articles; and as, of course, it is very desirable to build our churches now-a-days as cheaply as possible, a neat, unexpensive substitute has been devised, which is now generally adopted, and which I proposed as the most economical arrangement for your new edifice.'

" 'And pray what is that?' asked Mr. Sanderson.

" 'A portable vase of white Wedgwood ware, with a cover to it, which can be set *on* the communion table, when there is a baptism; and *under* it, when not wanted.'

" 'I am very sorry to hear that anything is being "generally adopted" in our churches which is directly forbidden by the canons of the Church,' said Mr. Sanderson.

" 'Forbidden, sir! how so?' inquired Mr. Compo.

" 'If you will turn to the eighty-first canon you will see. It is there appointed that "there shall be a font of *stone*"—not of crockery—"in every church and chapel where baptism is to be ministered;" that it shall "be set in the ancient usual places;" and, therefore, neither *on* the communion-table, nor *under* it; and that in this font "*only* the minister shall baptize publicly." There are just three points insisted on by the canon, and every one of them is infringed by your economical arrangement.'

" Mr. Compo could, of course, only confess that he had never studied the canons, and express his opinion that many of those who had to do with new churches were in just the same predicament.

" 'I fear it may be the case,' replied Mr. Sanderson; 'but for myself, I must beg to decline an earthenware font, and to insist on one of stone; and there will be the less difficulty on this point, as the old font has been found to be very little injured.'

" Mr. Compo's face brightened up at the last piece of intelligence. 'I am very glad to hear it, sir; a new stone font would be very expensive, and it is quite essential in these days to do these sort of things as cheap as possible.'

" 'Why?' asked Mr. Sanderson, drily.

" 'Because people grudge the expense.'

" 'You are an architect, I believe, in considerable practice, and you have, no doubt, the means of judging. But allow me to ask you, do you find people equally grudging of expense when their own houses are to be built?'

" Mr. Compo could hardly forbear smiling at the simplicity (as it appeared to him) of such a question. 'No, no; they are lavish enough where their personal comforts are concerned: but we have all got into the way of speaking and acting, as if anything was good enough for a church.'

" 'Any thing good enough for a church? *Nothing* is good enough for a church—nothing too costly—nothing too precious! You look surprised, Mr. Compo,' continued the rector of Tadbrook, 'at hearing such language. Certainly it is little in accordance with the feelings of the present day; little in accordance with the principles which those feelings have forced you to adopt as a church-builder. But I appeal from both to the word of God. I find there that the highest of all worship is that which is purely spiritual. I find there that the costliest offerings we can make to God are all unworthy of Him; we can but give Him of His own. But I find there likewise, that the Most High will, nevertheless, condescend to dwell in temples built with hands; and I find that those who laboured most earnestly to make His

temples most worthy (so far as human means will allow) of His presence, by precious gifts and offerings, are ever spoken of with commendation. When, therefore, I see a self-indulgent age stinting Him of the honour due to his name and house—pleading its own poverty, or arguing that the enriching and adorning of churches is unnecessary—I can only listen with sorrow and disgust, to what must be either hypocrisy or self-deception. Upon such grounds I detest the very name of a “cheap church.” And believe me, sir, gentlemen of your profession could hardly do this country greater service than by positively refusing to aid the schemes by which modern covetousness is continually endeavouring to defraud the Almighty of His own.”—(pp. 96—100)

But the cheap church was not to be got rid of, for the adoption of Mr. Compo's plan was made by Major, or rather Mrs. Major Clutterbuck, the sole condition on which the money would be lent; and accordingly the vestry, which was called for the purpose of considering the matter, determined that the cheapest plan was the best. Some thought Mr. Compo's design very fine; some, who could not think so, “did not admire pomp;”—operations therefore were commenced without delay, and accordingly Chapter VI. is intended to shew “*How a cheap bargain may prove a dear one.*” The paradox, however, is very ingeniously solved. In this *dignus rindice nodus* poetry would have required the interference of a Deity—in plain prose it is effected by the agency of a drunken cobbler, and Messrs. Stynx and Kindlefintz' patent fifty-shilling stove. Not to hold our readers in suspense, after all preliminary arrangements have been made, the sacred music selected, the Duchess of Thetford engaged to attend, the pulpit and communion table put into the Clutterbuck livery, and the Rev. Lorenzo Bellamour, a popular preacher from the next watering-place, “very pink and white, with a profusion of black hair,” advertised in large red letters to occupy the pulpit; nay, even the calves-foot jelly prepared which the Rev. Lorenzo should take in the vestry, as he was wont, in order “to soften his voice before preaching a charity-sermon”—the Church takes fire the very evening before the grand opening—the ice is four inches thick, and all the parish hasten once more to the Churchyard only in time “to see the new building one mass of flame from end to end, and to stand by for one short half-hour, when both nave and tower having yielded to the devouring element, came tumbling down, galleries, turrets and all; and the lurid glare which had been shed over hill and vale, and alarmed the country for miles round, sunk down at once, and a heap of glowing ashes was nearly all that remained of Mr. Compo's unsubstantial edifice.”

Chapter VII. and last is entitled, “*The same work to be done, and another way of doing it.*” What this way is, will best be told by the author himself in the following lively dialogue, in which the dramatis personæ are the Archdeacon, Dr. Sharpe; the

rector; his churchwarden, William Andrewes; and the parochial functionary, Wat Tyler, who is almost as much stunned and stupified by the twofold disaster, as his redoubtable predecessor was by the mace of Sir William Walworth:—

“ ‘Pray, gentlemen,’ said Dr. Sharpe, ‘what steps are you taking about the rebuilding of the church?’

“ ‘Indeed, sir, I am quite at a loss to devise what is to be done,’ replied William Andrewes.

“ ‘I can’t imagine how we shall get out of this fresh difficulty,’ rejoined Walter Tyler.

“ ‘What a pity you had so many inflammable materials,’ said the Archdeacon.

“ ‘Terrible expense; we shall be ruined,’ groaned forth the disconsolate Walter.

“ ‘No doubt, no doubt,’ continued the Archdeacon. ‘What is too cheap for a church may nevertheless be too dear for a bonfire.’

“ ‘Even William Andrewes stared at this speech, for he thought it very unfeeling: but he said nothing, and Dr. Sharpe proceeded. ‘It is my duty, you know, gentlemen, to see that the parishioners of Tadbrook are not kept without a place of worship longer than can be avoided. Therefore, not an hour should be lost in making the necessary arrangements. Have you any hope of getting assistance in the way of subscriptions?’

“ ‘Miss Mildways has offered us five-and-twenty pounds; but that,’ continued Walter, with a shrug, ‘won’t rebuild a church.’

“ ‘No,’ said the Archdeacon; and down went the corners of his mouth.

“ ‘No,’ responded Mr. Sanderson, with a sigh, intently regarding a fly on the ceiling.

“ ‘Have you no further contributions?’ asked Dr. Sharpe.

“ ‘No, sir,’ replied William Andrewes, ‘only the Rev. Lorenzo Bellamour sent us’ —

“ ‘What?’ asked William Tyler, interrupting him eagerly.

“ ‘*His best wishes,*’ replied his colleague.

“ ‘Well, really, gentlemen, something must be done. Won’t Mrs. Clutterbuck set up another bazaar?’

“ ‘I had thought of that already, sir,’ replied Mr. Tyler, ‘but on inquiry I find that her hands are full. She has engaged with some other charitable ladies, who take an interest in the poor Africans, to provide funds for founding a professorship of Political Economy at Tombuctoo. So we must not hope for her assistance at present, in matters near home.’

“ ‘Do you think we could secure the valuable aid of Signor Salamandro?’ said Mr. Sanderson, very demurely, to William Andrewes.

“ ‘Walter Tyler, to whom the question was *not* addressed, grew very red in the face, and would probably have given an angry answer, but William Andrewes anticipated him. He hardly knew what to make of such bantering. But he was full of good humour, and replied, ‘Ah, sir, I fear we are too late: the poor signor has gone further than even to Ispahan; for I understand that, having put the red hot poker into a barrel of gunpowder 499 times with perfect success, the five hundredth experiment failed; the powder went off, and so did the roof of the house, and the signor himself, and dead or alive he has never been heard of since.’

“ ‘Very unlucky, indeed,’ said the Archdeacon; ‘fortune seems to have a spite against St. Antholin’s. Well, you must consult Mr. Compo again, I suppose.’

“ ‘I wish we could, with all my heart,’ replied Walter Tyler, with a sigh; ‘but I heard this morning that he was going out directly to Botany Bay—to Australia.’

" 'Voluntarily, or involuntarily?' asked Mr. Sanderson, who certainly had no very charitable feelings towards the last architect of St. Antholin's.

" 'He is going out,' continued Walter Tyler, without answering the inquiry, 'to build a palace for Judge Greenacre. He is to have his expenses paid out and home, and to have a handsome annuity settled on him besides.'

" 'I trust, with all my heart,' said the Archdeacon, 'that he will not come back again.'

" 'No,' observed Mr. Sanderson, 'he cannot do better than stay there. I cannot conceive an employment more exactly suited to his taste and capacity than that of erecting lath and plaster palaces for prosperous expatriated pickpockets.'

" 'Well, gentlemen,' said Dr. Sharp, for he observed that Walter Tyler was getting very angry, 'you must forgive Mr. Sanderson and myself for keeping you so long in suspense, when we have something extremely pleasing to impart to you. It seems you are quite at a loss to devise any plan for raising funds towards the rebuilding of your church. I am thankful to say that I believe the difficulty is obviated. Gentlemen,' he continued, 'I have good news for you, so good that you will hardly believe it. And I must take leave to say, that such a piece of good fortune is wholly undeserved by the parishioners of Tadbrook. I have to inform you, that no less a sum than six thousand pounds has been placed at the disposal of Mr. Sanderson and myself, upon certain conditions, for the rebuilding of St. Antholin's.'

" 'Six thousand pounds!' exclaimed the churchwardens, in a breath. 'Six thousand pounds, sir! Is it possible?'

" 'Not only possible, but certain,' replied Mr. Sanderson; 'and further, if more than six thousand pounds should be required, more than six thousand will be forthcoming.'

" 'Who in the world can have made such a magnificent present,' cried Walter Tyler, his ears tingling with delight. 'May I guess?'

" 'Yes, if you please,' said Mr. Sanderson; 'but if you guess till doom's-day, you will never learn from me whether you are right or wrong. The person in question desires to remain wholly unknown. The only point I feel myself at liberty to mention (and I do it by way of exciting others to similar acts of Christian liberality) is, that the person who makes so noble an offering to God, and His Church, is only enabled to do so by sacrificing a considerable portion of her whole fortune, and that when I felt inclined to suggest that a smaller sum would suffice, I was met by the answer, "I will not offer unto God of that which costs me nothing."'

" 'Never heard any thing so handsome in my life,' cried Walter Tyler; 'but do you really mean, sir, that you will not give us the slightest clue to discover our unknown benefactor?'

" 'I have solemnly promised her that I will never do so; and it is a promise I shall keep.'

" '*Her!*' the monosyllable escaped unsuspected from Mr. Sanderson's lips, and unnoticed by Walter Tyler. William Andrewes heard it, marked it, and drew his own conclusions, but from that moment he never was known to allude to the subject. He was in all his feelings a gentleman, and a Christian.'

" 'But the conditions—did you not say, sir, it was given upon conditions?'

" 'Yes,' replied the Archdeacon, 'and the conditions are these, that the church be in all points, save one, a fac-simile of that which was blown down.'

" 'We could not have a better model, certainly,' observed William Andrewes; 'but what is to be the single point of difference in the new edifice?'

" '*There are to be no pews,*' replied Dr. Sharpe; 'upon that point every thing depends, for unless this stipulation be agreed to I have no promise of the grant.'

" Walter Tyler's face rather lengthened at this, and he exclaimed, 'What

in the world will Mrs. Clutterbuck say? Her pew was the grandest thing in Mr. Compo's church, and nearly the grandest in the old one.'

" 'Leave Mrs. Clutterbuck to me,' answered the Rector; 'her feelings on this matter, however erroneous, are rather, I will undertake to say, the result of habit, than of pride and self-sufficiency. She has read her Bible too long and too well, not to know that we are all equal in God's house, and she has too kind a heart not to be glad to make any sacrifices (when the matter is fairly set before her) for her poorer neighbours. No, Mrs. Clutterbuck will not be the person who will give us any trouble.'

" Mr. Sanderson judged rightly of Mrs. Clutterbuck. *She* yielded the point like a Christian, but not so all:—Mrs. Spatterdash, the widow of the Snobbington sadler, having stood out valiantly for her rights and privileges, tailed off at last to a dissenting chapel, there to preserve her dignity unsullied by submission to an open sitting.

" 'It is a most munificent act, certainly,' observed Walter Tyler, after a minute's consideration, 'and no doubt it will take a large sum to build up such a church as the old one; but six thousand pounds seems almost above the mark. Don't you think, sir, that our benefactor would consent to hand over a thousand pounds or so, to pay for Mr. Compo's church, and ease the parish from such a heavy burden of debt?'

" 'No, sir,' said the Archdeacon, with a tone of sternness and severity so unlike his usual manner that it made his companion start. 'No, sir,' he repeated with increased vehemence, 'for such a purpose the person in question will not give one farthing; and were they disposed to do, I can assure you that my most earnest remonstrances should not be wanting to dissuade them from it. No, sir, though I do not wish to pain you, it is fit you should see this matter as the rest of the world sees it. If the parishioners of Tadbrook are in debt and difficulties, they have no one to blame for it but themselves. They chose to follow the fashion of the times in leaving God's house to decay and ruin; they grudged all necessary repairs, and when they saw their church in ruins they set about rebuilding it in so mean and parsimonious a spirit, that even if that wretched pile had not been burnt down, it would have fallen of itself in a very few years. So fully aware was your unknown benefactor of this, that that person had provided by will for the future rebuilding of your church on the old model, so soon as Mr. Compo's edifice had become dangerous: so that the conflagration only hastened the execution of a long-formed plan. But that person had seen with too deep indignation your treatment of the ancient fabric to intrust you with the erection of a new one, and, moreover, is resolved to leave you to get out of debt as you can. You will have a new church, by that person's bounty; but it is right, for the sake of other parishes, that you should learn by practical experience the evils of the system you have chosen to follow. To help you further would be to offer a premium on carelessness and covetousness.'"—(pp. 139—148.)

We leave our readers, as Mr. Paget leaves us, to form an opinion for themselves as to the identity of this munificent benefactress, for Mr. Sanderson has unwarily disclosed the donor's sex, though not her name. We shall investigate rather what we conceive to be the moral of the tale—or, if not the moral, at least the reason why it is called a "Tale for the Times." The times, God be praised, are, in comparison, at least, with those which have preceded them, times of Church-building—and the great majority of Churchmen, being "shallow-minded people who deal in practical questions," are of opinion that it is better to have a cheap Church than no Church at all—and, moreover, where there are 1000 persons requiring imme-

diate accommodation, that it is preferable to seat one third in galleries than either to exclude them altogether from public worship, or drive them to the open tabernacles of dissent. Mr. Paget says indeed, and we would not question his sincerity, "that he would rather have cheap Churches in profusion, than costly and few;" with the proviso, however, "that they were erected and arranged after primitive models." What he means by *primitive models*, indeed, he does not condescend to tell us; and from the context we must suppose that he refers to those times when men (to use his own phrase) were accustomed "*to build as an act of worship*," and usurpers, who had waded to the throne, through seas of blood, thought to obliterate the record of their crimes, and manifest the sincerity of their repentance, by expending the revenue of a kingdom on the erection of a convent or a cathedral. Had he gone back to models *really* primitive, he would have found himself in the houses of Lydia and of Gaius, or in the school of Tyrannus, or in an "upper chamber" at Jerusalem—and indeed the first principle of Christian worship seems to have been the assembling of believers in the first convenient place that might present itself, whether in the wilderness, or the mountain cave, or by the sea-side, wherever two or three could be gathered together in the name of Jesus. And though we do not use this as any argument to prove that it is "the delight of God," in the emphatic language of Hooker, "to dwell beggarly," yet we *do* think that it demonstrates the place to be a secondary concern in religious worship—and we *do* think, moreover, as a "practical question," that the Bishop of London will far more effectually advance the great object of his high and responsible office, in collecting the scattered sheep of Christ, the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, by erecting ten Churches of modern gothic in the poor and populous district of Bethnal Green, than by rearing one vast pile that should parody York Minister, or emulate St. Paul's Cathedral. In this case, indeed, we are under no apprehension of lath-and-plaster churches, for we know well that his lordship's taste is formed on far too good a model to commit the superintendence of any of the metropolitan Churches to a Mr. Compo; and, notwithstanding Mr. Paget's sneer, if we could compare the four last built Churches raised under Bishop Bloomfield's auspices with the four oldest in his diocese, whatever we might think of the later style of architecture, we should probably find 5000 persons comfortably accommodated in the one, and 1000 or 1500 inconveniently scattered through the other. While then we are quite willing to admit the former part of Mr. Paget's moral—that it is sound policy to repair an old and dilapidated Church in good time—we cannot so far acquiesce in

the latter, as to determine that it is a safe principle never to build a cheap one. We can only engage, for ourselves and for our readers, that whenever a Miss Mildways will present us for such a purpose with six thousand pounds, we will never borrow a thousand of Major or Mrs. Clutterbuck for the pleasure of employing a Mr. Compo.

The mention of these three distinguished personages leads us to say a word on Mr. Paget's peculiar ingenuity in that department of novel-writing which may be termed *onomatography*—the invention of appropriate or, at least, significant names. One of our essayists, we forget which at this moment, has written an ingenious paper in answer to the question—"What's in a name?" in which he proves to demonstration that the loves of Gubbins and Clutterbuck, however deep the interest or tragical the catastrophe of the tale, would never beguile the reader of a tear, all human sympathies being reserved for the Howard, the Mandeville, and the de Roubigne. "What's in a name," however, none can teach us better than Mr. Paget, who thus hits off a character by a word, and sometimes with more wit than decency; as when he designates the old rector, who changed his surplice once in six months, Dr. Fustifowl; and immortalizes the inventors of the fifty-shilling stove by the appellation of Messrs. Stynx and Kindleflintz. In like manner, Mrs. Brassington is to talk and laugh with the men; Rose Smudge to prepare drawings for the sale; Mr. Compo is the architect, and his battlements are made of Dabbaway's patent cement; a new peer is Lord Mobgrub; Crabley, the sour dissenter, seconds the motion made by Tapps, the drunken cobbler; and the only parishioner who will not condescend to sit in an unpewed Church is Mrs. Spatterdash, the widow of the Snobbington saddler. Mr. Compo is indeed a jewel of his kind, but his "classical recollections" are a little too absurd even for a professor of modern gothic. Wishing our readers, however, to part on good terms with Mr. Paget, we shall conclude with a choice specimen of this distinguished character; only expressing our surprise that since the "leaders of the movement" thought fit to avail themselves of the aid of comedy, they did not take more precaution to prevent it from degenerating into farce. The professor is addressing himself to Miss Mildways:

" 'Dare say you hardly know where you are, me'm; things have been so changed within the last six weeks. You are an old inhabitant of the parish, me'm, no doubt (at least, if it be possible that a lady can be an *old* inhabitant), and I shouldn't wonder if you were lost in surprise to find how things are being transmogrified: but we live in an age of changes, me'm: the wisdom of our ancestors, and all those sort of things, are getting out of date; and while respectable people like yourself, me'm, are wondering, the very changes themselves are changed. Now, if I might be so bold, I should like to know what the change *here* is which strikes you most?'

" 'Oh, sir,' said Miss Mildways, provoked even beyond *her* patience, 'it

is quite identical in kind with all the other changes of the present day. What I left *stone*, I find *stucco*.'

" 'Ha! ha! ha! very good,' cried Mr. Compo, with his wonted laugh of affectation, 'very good. "What I left stone, I find stucco." Why, me'm, you do me too much honour. You actually apply to me, what, if my classical recollections fail not, was the boast of one of the Roman emperors with respect to the imperial city herself: he found it stone, and left it stucco. Something of that kind, wasn't it, Mr. Sanderson? you are more conversant with the Mantuan bard than I am.'

" 'Not exactly, I think,' replied the Rector, who, as may be supposed, could hardly keep his countenance.

" 'May be so,' rejoined Mr. Compo; 'but something of the kind was said, depend upon it. Oh! I remember; it was not stucco, but Roman cement. It was a remark, me'm, which Heliogabalus made to Julius Cæsar, when he had finished the restoration of the Vatican. "Conscript Father," said he, "I found this building *stone*, and I leave it *Roman cement*." But to proceed with what I was saying, you find great changes here, me'm; but if you'll be kind enough to pay us a visit in a month's time, I'll undertake to say you'll not accuse us of having been asleep. In old times it took half a century to build a church: I'll build one in half a year, easy. We run up these things now-a-days, me'm, in no time: don't let the grass grow under our feet. "Keep moving," is my motto; and we *do* keep moving. Prodigious rapid we are, surely,' exclaimed Mr. Compo, with a prolonged enunciation of the last syllable, an ecstatic chuckle of self-satisfaction, and a vehement rubbing of his hands.'—(pp. 109—111.)

By way of comment upon this, we would only ask Mr. Paget whether he really thinks that anything would be gained by conforming to primitive models in the slowness as well as the stability of the work. If half a century is to be occupied in building a Church, will Mr. Paget just have the goodness to tell us, **WHAT, IN THE INTERVAL, WILL HAVE BECOME OF THE CONGREGATION?**

A PLEA FOR THE POOR, *shewing how the proposed Repeal of the existing Corn Laws will affect the interests of the Working Classes.* By the Hon. and Rev. BAPTIST W. NOEL, M.A., Minister of St. John's Chapel. London: Nisbet. 1841.

"It is well known, that in olden time there flourished a set of empirics and visionaries, who, either in folly or in fraud, devoted themselves to the task of searching for what they called the philosopher's stone. These men absurdly appropriated to themselves the name of *Alchymists*; and by degrees the meaning of the word, in common usance, became generally thus perverted.

"In our own days a class of dreamers and pretenders has arisen in their room, rivalling them in folly, and far exceeding them in the mischief they have been able to perpetrate. And these men, too, have contrived to lay hold of a respectable name, and to fasten it especially upon their own works: so that the very title of *Political Economist* is never given now to any but those who adopt the method of these gentry, which consists simply of abstract theory, constructed in perfect disregard of facts."

WE met with the above remark in a periodical work published about ten years back, and we have never forgotten it. We believe that the modern race of writers, who assume to themselves the name of "Political Economists," are among the most mischievous of all the unclean things that "liberalism" has spawned. If we had never found any cause to abhor these people before, we have assuredly abundant ground now, inasmuch as it is to *their* influence over the mind of an excellent man, that we owe the deplorable production now before us.

Mr. Noel is, as probably most of our readers are personally aware, a man of great natural sweetness and amiability of temper; but, further than this, he is a man who has been divinely taught to love his poor brother, "for whom Christ died." How very sad, then, is it, to find such a man, in spite of both his natural and his divinely-imparted benevolence of mind, deliberately sitting down to write, and print, and extensively publish, a tract of thirty-six pages *against the poor*!

He would probably be inclined to protest against this representation; and to say, that we were most unreasonably and unjustly assuming the whole point at issue; concluding him to be in error, and even criminally so, without having proved anything of the kind. We admit all this. We have done so purposely; for the sake of exhibiting and illustrating the injustice of which he himself has been guilty in his very title-page.

He calls his tract a *Plea for the Poor*. He takes for his motto such texts as these:—

"Blessed is he that considereth the poor; the Lord will deliver him in the time of trouble."—(Psalm xli. 1.)

"He that hath pity on the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given will he pay him again."—(Prov. xix. 17.)

"The righteous considereth the cause of the poor; but the wicked regardeth not to know it."—(Prov. xxix. 7.)

"If thou draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul, then shall thy light rise in obscurity, and thy darkness be as the noon-day. And the Lord shall guide thee continually, and satisfy thy soul in drouth, and make fat thy bones; and thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water whose waters fail not."—(Isaiah lviii. 10, 11.)

Now what is the drift of all this, and what must its effect be upon the minds of the thousands of ignorant or ill-informed people who will read his tract,—but to make them believe that all who desire the continuance of the existing Corn Laws are *not* willing to "consider the poor,"—are *not* desirous to "draw out their soul to the hungry,"—but rather require a great deal of argument and some very urgent "plea," to induce them to relax their greedy and unfeeling grasp on the poor man's hardly-earned daily bread! We would therefore retort upon Mr. Noel his own complaint, and ask him, Is this just? Rather, is it not a representation, hazardingly placed before an inflamed population, which is the *very opposite to the truth*.

It may be stated, in general terms, that the main body of the party called Conservative, is in favor of the continuance of the existing Corn Law; while the main body of the party called "Liberal" or ministerial, is urging its repeal. Now does not Mr. Noel very well know, that the first of these two parties,—the Conservative, embraces at least four-fifths of those who are in the habit of giving liberally to the poor, throughout the kingdom. If an inquiry were to be instituted, as to what class mainly supported the parochial schools, the hospitals, infirmaries, clothing societies,—or the other hundred schemes for relieving the wants of the poor,—is it not certain, from many samples which have already been produced, that a proportion of, *at least, four-fifths*, would be at once traced home to the pockets of those who are called "Conservatives?" Is it just, then, to hold up *these* to the people at large, as the class who require to have the duty of "having pity on the poor" especially pressed upon them? Or is it right to imply,—as Mr. Noel does, from his title-page to the last line of his tract, that it is from a disregard to the wants of the poor, that the Corn Laws are generally supported?

For our own part, we can declare most unreservedly, and as in the presence of the Searcher of Hearts,—that while we have a clear opinion of the desirableness of adherence to the existing Corn Law,—we rest that opinion, not upon any calculation of how it affects the landowner, or of how it affects the farmer; but mainly, and almost solely, upon a conviction that the maintenance of that law

is essential to the interests of the English *labourer*. If this point could be shewn to be an error, we should not feel sufficient interest in the question to write another line upon it. We desire to preserve the existing Corn Law solely *for the sake of the poor*.

We have said, that Mr. Noel has written this tract mainly *against the poor*. And we think that we should find it far easier to establish this, *our assumption*, than he would to establish *his*,—that the advocates of the existing Corn Laws have no “pity on the poor.”

For how stand the facts? The *poor* of England are the *labourers* of England. And the sole possession and main reliance of these is, and ever must be, on the *demand for labour*. Whatever tends to *lessen* that demand, is *against* them;—whatever tends to augment it, is *for* them. How, then, was this demand for labour distributed, according to the census of 1831?

In England, in that year, the males of twenty years of age and upwards were 8,199,984. These were of the following classes:—

Capitalists, Bankers, Professional Men, &c.	179,983
Employed in Trade or Crafts, as Masters or Workmen.....	964,177
Labourers, neither Manufacturing nor Agricultural	500,950
As Servants	70,629
Various Miscellaneous Occupations	189,389
<i>Agriculturists</i>	980,740
<i>Manufacturers</i>	314,106

In the controversy which has recently been raised, everything has been made to turn upon the relative numbers of the latter two classes. According to the above view the agriculturists are as *three to one*; nor will any of the previous items disturb this calculation. Professional men, bankers, shopkeepers, tailors, brick-layer’s labourers, &c., are dependent upon the two great classes of agriculturists and manufacturers, in the same proportion which those two classes bear to each other. For instance, 980,740 agriculturists must wear, day by day, 980,740 pairs of shoes; while 314,106 manufacturers would require only 314,106, and so throughout the whole.

The grand source of employment for the people, then, is, and must be, Agriculture. And in coming forward to touch this vital point, and to propose that the 980,740 English agriculturists shall be at once exposed to a competition with the serfs of Poland, from which competition they are at present protected, we contend that Mr. Noel writes, as directly and as fearfully as possible, *against the interests of the poor*.

He, of course, takes a totally different view. He admits, and in fact, makes it a basis of his argument, that employment for the

poor is the main thing to be desired ; but then he leaps, in a very strange manner, to the following extraordinary conclusion :—

“ Four hundred and thirteen thousand persons, added every year to the population of the kingdom, must be employed. Emigration cannot employ them, agriculture cannot, and manufactures can.”—(p. 34.)

Nothing can be more simple or easy than this way of settling the question. All difficulties vanish as by magic, before a reasoner who *makes all his facts as he wants them* ! “ Emigration cannot employ them, agriculture cannot, and manufactures can.”

First, we observe, that nothing can be more irrational than to present these 413,000 souls annually added, and to ask, as it were, “ Can emigration provide for them ? Can agriculture ? Can manufactures ? ”

A growth of population taking place simultaneously among all classes,—among the capitalists, among the professional men, among the shopkeepers, among the bricklayers, and shoemakers, and tailors,—is not to be taken up by any *one* class of employment,—such as agriculture solely, or manufactures solely ; but by *all*. Instead of saying, therefore, that “ agriculture cannot employ them, but manufactures can,” the more practical way of putting the question would be to ask, In which branch of industry is there the clearer path open ? In which, is there the greatest certainty of an advantageous employment of labour ? We have no hesitation in replying,—*In agriculture*.

A strange, but, alas, too common error, pervades Mr. Noel's tract ; that of taking for granted, what is wholly untrue, that the soil of England, as to its productive powers, is already fully occupied and employed. There cannot be a more fatal mistake.

Nor is Mr. Noel wholly free from blame, in adopting as his *own*, such rash assertions.

He cannot travel through any part of England without passing large tracts of available land, which are still wholly unoccupied. He cannot avoid observing, that of the land actually under cultivation, scarcely any will bear a comparison, as to the labour bestowed on it, or as to its returns, with the lands of Belgium or of Lucca.

Mr. Noel admits that our warehouses are already crammed with manufactured goods, for which the owners can find no market. He admits also that for food the demand of our own population is earnest and clamorous ; and yet,—strange to say,—he would set our unemployed hands to work to increase our glut of manufactured goods, rather than to augment our stock of food !

This monstrous anomaly in his plan can only be justified on the supposition that our whole territory is under cultivation ; and that every acre has its full complement of labourers. But what is the

fact? At this instant we have in these islands, *fifteen millions* of acres of waste lands, capable of being made to yield food for man. There are:—

“ In England	3,454,000
— Wales	530,000
— Scotland	5,950,000
— Ireland.....	4,900,000
— the Islands	106,000”*

And these are *exclusive* of other 16,000,000 which are admitted to be unprofitable to the cultivator.

The main fact, however, in the case, is, that of the lands under tillage, scarcely any are cultivated to the extent which they might be. Mr. Alison, whose really valuable work Mr. Noel would do well to study, thus illustrates this important point:—

“ It is stated by Mr. Cowling, whose accuracy on this subject is well known, and his statement is adopted by the learned and able Mr. Porter, that there is in England and Wales 27,700,000 cultivated acres, in Ireland 12,125,000, and in Scotland about 5,265,000, in all 45,090,000; and of these, he calculates that there are at present in cultivation by the spade and the plough 19,237,000 acres, and 27,000,000 in pasturage. That is just about two acres to every human being in the United Kingdom; the number of inhabitants in Great Britain and Ireland in 1827 being about 23,000,000, and the same proportion probably obtains at the present time, when their numbers are nearly 30,000,000. Now a full supply of subsistence for every living person in wheat is a quarter a year; so that at this rate there is only *one* quarter raised over the whole empire for every *two* acres of arable and meadow land. But an acre of arable land yields, on an average of all England, two quarters and five bushels, or somewhat more than two quarters and a half; so that every two acres is capable, at the present average, of maintaining *five* human beings, or five times the present inhabitants of the empire. Can there be the smallest doubt that in a few years this half quarter per acre might be turned into two quarters per acre, less than the existing average of England? Nay, is there not ground to believe that, by greater exertion, every acre might be made to produce three quarters, still less than the average of many of its counties? The first of these changes would at once yield food for four times, the last for six times the present inhabitants of the British Isles, independent altogether of the waste lands, &c., of which Mr. Cowling states there are 6,000,000 acres capable of being turned into arable and pasture lands, at present wholly uncultivated, which at the same rate would maintain nearly twenty millions more. So that if these data are correct, it will follow that about one hundred and twenty millions of human beings in the first view, and one hundred and eighty in the second, supposing our present population to be in round numbers thirty millions, might be maintained with ease and comfort from the territory of the United Kingdom alone; and supposing them all to be maintained on wheaten bread drawn from the arable, and butcher-meat raised on the pasture lands, without any intermixture of potatoes or inferior food, which is greatly more productive.” †

In truth the master-error in all Mr. Noel's suppositions, is that propounded by Satan through the pen of Malthus some fifty years since,—namely, that we have a “surplus population,” and must, as

* Porter's Tables, vol. i. p. 177.

† Alison on Population, vol. i. pp. 49—51.

our only alternative, *either* expatriate the people, or import food for them. "God," says Mr. Noel, "has provided for our people corn, *not in their own crowded country*, but in others *less densely* peopled."

We wish Mr. Noel would take his political economy from the Bible, and not from such writers as Malthus and M'Culloch. Palestine, a country scarcely larger than Wales, had, in the days of David, 1,300,000 "men that drew sword," representing a population of more than six millions. It was, therefore, far more densely peopled than England is, or is ever likely to be. But was it "crowded," or too "densely peopled?" Was it compelled to establish factories to employ its surplus population? Or was it necessitated to import food for its starving people? Far from it. Under Solomon the population greatly increased, there can be no doubt; but what is the scripture account of their state? "Judah and Israel were **MANY**, *as the sand which is by the sea for multitude; eating and drinking, and making merry.*" (1 Kings iv. 20.) And, so far from being compelled to fly to manufactures to employ the people, and to have wherewithal to purchase food, they took the happier course of importing manufactures, (1 Kings x. 28,) and of paying other nations by their surplus corn. (1 Kings v. 11.) Nor let us be told that these results were owing to the richness of the soil of Palestine. The most productive fields in the world at this moment are those of Belgium, which three hundred years since were pure sand. The productiveness of a land depends mainly on the labour and culture bestowed on it. Where is the richness of Palestine now?

We maintain, therefore, that the assumption which Mr. Noel is so fond of using,—that "the land is already thoroughly cultivated," and "cannot employ the additional population," is wholly unfounded. The Holy Land, in David's time, sustained and employed a far greater (comparative) population in comfort and happiness. Nor are we to be told that this was a peculiar or supernatural case. Europe at the present instant shows us instances of populations far more dense than that of England, and yet enjoying plenty:—

"A vast population is to be found in Switzerland, existing along with the utmost well-being of the peasantry. 'The environs of Zurich,' says Mr. Coxe, 'for the mild beauties of nature and the well-being of the peasantry, is not surpassed by any spot on the habitable globe.' Yet the density of the population in this district is unequalled in any part of Europe. The inhabitants are exceedingly industrious. There are in the whole canton 217,000 acres in grain, 42,000 in vineyards, and 103,000 in forests; and it contains 175,000 souls, which is about an individual to every 2½ acres—a degree of density exceeding that of Ireland, where, for 26,000,000 arable acres, there are 8,000,000 inhabitants. You will look in vain, however, for the misery of Ireland on the banks of the Lake of Zurich. Indigence is nowhere to be found. Wherever you turn your eyes, smiling cottages with green windows

and white walls are alone to be seen, half concealed by the luxuriant fruit-trees that surround them, or glittering in the sunny margin of the lake. Considering how large a proportion of the canton is rock or forest, this population is enormous. In five parishes on the borders of the lake there are 8498 souls, and they contain only 6050 acres of arable land, 3407 of pasture, and 698 of vines, or scarcely *an acre and a quarter to each individual*—a degree of density surpassing that of any other part of Europe. Yet there is nowhere to be seen such an extraordinary degree of comfort among the peasantry.”*

“In every part of Flanders the rural scene presents the most agreeable objects: fields covered by fruitful crops, meadows feeding numerous herds, neat and commodious farm-houses, set singly or in groups, villages embowered with trees, and divided from each other by small intervals. The bounty of nature is diffused in decent competence through the multitude that inhabits it, and the wholesome fare and neat dwellings of the labourer attest that he receives his share of the riches with which nature crowns his fields. A vast population is diffused through the country, each of whom finds in the produce of his little farm, or in the manual labour which the husbandry of his neighbour requires, the means of abundant livelihood. The distinguishing features of the country are, the industry and riches of the inhabitants, the number, magnitude, and population of the cities, and the unrivalled perfection to which the cultivation of the soil has been carried. Commerce and manufactures have shared in the vicissitudes of political affairs, and the industry of the cities is in most places on the decline; but agriculture is undecayed, and in its different branches the numerous inhabitants find the means of a comfortable maintenance.”†

“The examples of Switzerland and the Netherlands are peculiarly valuable, because they afford specimens of public felicity combined with the greatest degree of *density in the population*. The population of Flanders amounts to 507 the square mile, and that of Holland to 284: the Pays de Vaud contains 658, and the arable territory of Zurich 692: whereas France contains 214, and Great Britain 270. The progress of population, therefore, affords no reason to anticipate an increase in the misery of the people, when it is accompanied by the political advantages which develop the limitations to its advance. Humanity would have no cause to regret an increase of the numbers of the species, which should cover the plains of the world with the husbandry of Flanders, or its mountains with the peasantry of Switzerland.”‡

But we must devote a few words to the second of Mr. Noel's main assumptions.

While “agriculture,”—he tells us,—“cannot employ the people, *manufactures can*.”

Now in a former page Mr. Noel had himself told us, that in a recent visit to Manchester he “saw some mills closed; others working half-time; and in the store-rooms immense piles of goods heaped up to the very ceilings, for which the manufacturers could find no profitable sale.”

And yet, after witnessing all this, he coolly assures us, that we must have employment for the people—that “agriculture cannot employ them, but that manufactures can!”

This must strike every one as rather paradoxical. But the key to the whole is found in another bold *assumption*.

* Alison on Population, vol. i. pp. 418, 419.

† Ibid. vol. i. p. 423.

‡ Ibid. vol. i. p. 428.

It had been assumed, in the first place, that every acre of available land in England was under cultivation; though our own eyes, as well as the statistical returns, told us of millions of acres still untouched. It had been assumed, also, that the land which was under cultivation was brought to the highest state of productiveness, although the slightest glance at the facts shewed us nearly 30,000,000 of acres of meadow and pasture land; which, if given to the plough, would employ and feed countless millions more than they now do, and which, if given to the spade, would support, of themselves, more than sixty millions of human beings! All this is quietly forgotten in Mr. Noel's assumptions, that the land is already burdened with population. But we now come to a second class of assumptions, which are even more startling than the first.

Although we are now suffering prodigious distress from the obvious cause of an over-production of manufactures—Mr. Noel hesitates not to assure us that manufactures can take up and employ all our increase of 413,000 per annum, if only the corn laws are repealed, and a fixed duty of 8s. per quarter substituted for the present moveable scale. And how does he arrive at this comfortable assurance? By merely assuming two things:—1. That if we open our ports to foreign corn, the ports of the Continent will immediately be opened to British manufactures. 2. That the result would be, a vast increase in the demand for British goods.

Now we have not the slightest expectation that either of these hopes would be realized. The Germans are bent on encouraging their own manufactures; they have been sedulously and earnestly pursuing this object for many years; nor will our willingness to purchase corn from them at all induce them to alter their course. They do not wish to have the price of food enhanced among them by our drawing off their supplies; nor do they wish to expose their native manufactures to unnecessary competition. There is no rational ground whatever for imagining that our consenting to purchase their corn, will induce any considerable change in their commercial restrictions.

But why should such a point as this be left to *supposition*? What right has any ministry in England to propose so fearful an experiment, to be tried in the dark! The ground, the sole ground on which the change is advocated,—the entire basis of Mr. Noel's argument, is,—that if we will take the corn of Prussia, the Prussians will take the manufactures of England. Now why should this governing point of the question be left to a probability, a hope, a conjecture? What difficulty can exist in obtaining a plain answer, Yes or No, from the Prussian government? If they desire that we should open our ports to their corn, they would of

course enter into negotiations to obtain that object. But we believe that the fact is, that they have been already sounded on this point, and shew not the least disposition to treat. If this be so, what folly, what blindness would it be, to alter our own course upon the entirely mistaken assumption, that they would meet us by similar concessions.

The second of Mr. Noel's assumptions is,—that if such a concession were made; and if the continental ports were opened to our manufactures,—the consequence would be, a vast increase of demand. We believe that this also is an entirely baseless assumption. Mr. Noel tells us, that the people of the Continent, to revenge themselves on our corn laws, persist in preferring to “manufacture for themselves, against their own interest, *dearer and worse* goods than they could buy of us.” If he would consult our merchants and manufacturers, he would learn his mistake. He would soon be told of the various markets, in all parts of the world, out of which the manufacturers of Saxony, Prussia, and Switzerland are now driving us, by producing *better and cheaper* goods than we can offer. A Leicester stocking-maker, Mr. Rawson, at an Anti-Corn Law Meeting in 1838, said—

“He was about to give a large order for hosiery to a commercial traveller from Saxony, on which he should have to pay five per cent. expenses, and twenty per cent. duty, and yet should have a handsome profit remaining, for he bought for 2s. 6d. what he could not procure in Nottingham for less than 5s.”

Again, Mr. Gregg, the late M.P. for Manchester, a warm opponent of the corn laws, said, in one of his speeches—

“I have a specimen of German prints, which is sold at 15s. 6d. the piece, and a similar one in England costs 17s. 6d. The German exceeds the English both in execution and work.”

Now with this plain testimony before us, and actually finding, as we do, that German manufacturers are underselling us in every market in the world,—how weak, how irrational would it be, to legislate upon the utterly groundless hope, that if we could only obtain entrance for our manufactures into Germany, we must of course drive the German manufacturers out of the field. How should such a result be obtained? The Saxons and Prussians are clever, energetic, industrious. They have now the same machinery with ourselves. Their habits are simpler; their mode of life more frugal; their taxation lighter. How should it happen, then, that we could compete with them in the fabrication of cottons or woollens, paying cost of transit, &c., and yet underselling them at their own doors?

But, lastly, there is this grand fallacy constantly pervading all

the arguments of the Corn-Law Repealers—*of mistaking a change of customers for an increase of trade.*

The burden of Mr. Noel's "Plea" is constantly this, "Let us take corn from the people on the Continent, and then they will take manufactures from us. If we will not buy from them, neither can they buy from us."

Now this reasoning is just as good for "home consumption" as for application to our dealings with foreigners. No one can attempt to deny, that it is quite as true of our own farmers as of those of Poland,—that if we do not buy of them they cannot buy of us.

Suppose, then, a million of quarters of wheat imported, because we can buy it at 40s. per quarter from the Poles or the Prussians, while our own farmers ask 60s. The result is, that £2,000,000 sterling is scattered among the continental corn-growers, and £3,000,000 less than heretofore is brought into the home market. The Germans become *more* able than before to buy our manufactures, *if they choose to do so*; but the English farmers become *less* able. In what way can the manufacturer be benefited by the change?

No one attempts to deny,—no one *can* deny,—that the introduction of foreign corn will tend to push the English corn out of the market. The price will be lowered; the demand, to the English farmer, will be lessened by the new competition. All this obviously tends to weaken and depress the home market for manufactures. The farmer, the labourer, and the landlord will all spend less money in the shops, for the obvious reason, that they will have less money to spend.

A *certain* damage then is done, But where is the recompensing gain? It is all *uncertain*. It is uncertain, what sort of entrance we shall gain, for our manufactured goods upon the continent. It is uncertain in what branch of manufactures we shall have any chance of competing successfully with the clever and industrious Germans. It is uncertain, lastly, what proportion of the very large sum which we must pay for corn, on a free-trade system, will ever be likely to flow back to us, in exchange for our manufactures.

But amidst all this uncertainty, *one* thing is certain—namely, that a substitution of a fixed duty for the present system, would lead to large imports of corn from the continent. That it would do so, is confessed and rather boasted of, by the advocates of free trade; in fact, if this be not the object, and an object likely to be attained by the proposed change, then is the present agitation a most unwarranted and wicked one.

It would bring much foreign corn into our market, displacing

much of British growth. It would thus discourage agriculture ; force the farmer to give up the growth of corn on the poorer lands ; and in this way throw great numbers of the present farm-labourers out of employ. All this clear and positive *evil* it must produce. The countervailing good is distant, partial, and most uncertain. Hence, we say, that in thus advocating an immediate evil, in the vain hope of a distant and doubtful good, Mr. Noel's plea is not *for*, but *against* the poor.

THE PRISONERS OF AUSTRALIA. *A Narrative.* By the Author of "Miriam," &c. London: Hatchard. 1841.

"I WAS in prison, and ye visited me." If in this Scripture be set forth as one of the characteristics of the disciples of Christ, we doubt not that the Author of this little volume has long since been made free of that goodly company. A sojourner, for a brief period, in a land abounding in things new and strange to an inhabitant of Europe, her attention was occupied by one only object, the instruction, namely, and improvement of those wretched outcasts from home and country, the female "prisoners of Australia." That such was the motive which led her to undertake a voyage

"Half around the sea-girt ball,"

she does not indeed inform us. But there is no lack of evidence to show with what singleness of purpose, and, it may be added, with how much success, she laboured in this holy vocation. "Early in June" (1836) the vessel in which she was embarked "passed through Bass's Straits, and entered the harbour of Sydney." On the 18th of the same month we find her visiting, in company with Mr. Marsden, the inmates of "the Paramatta (penal) Factory." Here were imprisoned nearly seven hundred unhappy beings, divided into different classes according to the enormity of their crimes.

These classes, three in number, the benevolent stranger saw and conversed with in turn, beginning with the least guilty, and descending to the vilest and most degraded. She had previously been warned of the risk of personal insult from these abandoned women, to which she was about to expose herself, and of the probable fruitlessness of her efforts in their behalf. She was "even told by some, that she was about to enter into scenes such as no female of delicacy could with propriety encounter." But strong

in the holiness of her cause, and encouraged by the example of one noble spirit in her native land, she adhered to her resolution, and proved in her very first interview with these "prisoners of Australia," that "where women will plead with women upon the broad ground of Christian charity, and virtue go forth to the depraved—not to condemn but to persuade—to soothe and not to imitate—the most iniquitous will scarcely fail to respect such sympathy, even should it win nothing beyond it."—(p. 8.)

So much encouragement, indeed, did she receive from her first visit to the Factory, that she determined to repeat it on the following day:—

"The matron was desired to apprise the prisoners of my intention; and immediately after service, leaving Mr. Marsden, I followed the undermatron as before, and found the third class (the most depraved) awaiting me, arranged in a circle round the inner court. There was a murmur of recognition as I entered, and to my great surprise several of them curtsied, a mark of respect which I found *very rare* in the colony. I then told them, that, in compliance with the wish they had expressed of seeing me again, I had come to devote an hour to them, if they would listen while I read a chapter in the Bible, at the same time requesting that all might go quietly away who did not like to hear me, as I did not ask any to do so against their will, especially the Roman Catholics; as being myself a Protestant, as a Protestant only could I venture to exhort them. I paused a few moments, during which not a sound was heard, nor did one move away, but rather drawing in a closer circle round me, they manifested the most perfect attention and good order."—(pp. 19, 20.)

At a subsequent page our Authoress thus describes the effect produced by her affectionate expostulations:—

"Although hemmed in by a crowd of nearly three hundred women of the most abandoned character, I heard not one word which could offend the most refined or delicate mind; so far from it, fallen as they were in sin and shame, still many an ear was open to the voice of the gospel, and many a heart responded to the sympathy of a Saviour's love. I stood *alone* among them all, with no defence against insult but that which the Bible afforded me; yet, during an interview of two hours, the only language which I heard was that of blessing; the only sounds which fell as murmurs around me were those of bitter weeping, although I said many things which human nature, even in its best state, feels hard to bear."—(pp. 33, 34.)

Oh, fallen as is poor human nature, surely it is still possible to think too ill of it! Where was ever yet found the heart that kindness (only satisfy it that real kindness is intended) could not move and soften? What says an Apostle concerning the noblest affection that ever swayed the soul of man—"We love Him because he first loved us."

Than the miserable exiles of Australia, speaking of them as a body, earth perhaps contains no viler slaves of sin and Satan. Here, indeed, the terrible language of the Bible finds its most literal application—"filled with all unrighteousness, fornication,

wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful."

Yet even into this mass of moral putrefaction let a leaven of healthful principle be infused, and allowed freely to operate, and soon shall you see a blessed change—tears springing from eyes long bound up in frosts of more than Arctic sternness—the blush of ingenuous shame mantling the cheek of bare-faced profligacy—the confession of penitential anguish, and the bitter cry for mercy bursting from lips that had never opened but to blaspheme.

And why should not the repentant sinner again become a useful, aye and an honourable, member of that very society which once cast him forth as a loathing and a curse? Why should man strive to bar up the door of pity and forgiveness which God sees fit to throw wide open? The end of all legitimate punishment is twofold—to protect the innocent, and to reclaim the guilty. Is it not, we ask, as certain as it is lamentable, that we have hitherto confined our attention too exclusively to the former? But, blessed be God, a happier day is breaking.

From the little volume before us, we must quote one example of the healing influence of Christian kindness. Should it have fallen under the notice, as we doubt not it has, of the excellent individual whose name it records, we would not barter the feelings which it must have stirred up in his bosom for all the wealth of Croesus.

"It was at the close of a sabbath-day that I sallied forth for an evening stroll, and wending my lonely way, almost without a motive, save for the refreshment of a cool sea-breeze, which at that moment was springing up with the rising tide, I unconsciously wandered to a convict's hut which stood on the borders of the coast. Attracted by the sound of voices, as if of children reading, I paused to listen; and although still too far from the dwelling distinctly to hear the subject of such discourse, I saw through the open doorway what was passing within. The father of the family, *a convict*, sat near the entrance, with a young child on his knee, while three older ones were grouped around him reading from the Scriptures, which from time to time he explained to them, and appeared earnestly exhorting his children to love and obey God, even as they were required by the will of God to do. Unwilling to intrude upon a family thus engaged, I returned home, unperceived by those who had thus attracted and interested me; but on the following day I heard from the lips of his own wife the circumstances of this convict's transportation, and of her own heroic resolution, from the moment of his condemnation, never to leave or to abandon him, whatever might be his destiny. Providentially he had been assigned to the service of the Agricultural Company, and, under the Christian teaching of Sir Edward Parry, both he and his wife had, humanly speaking, been led to see the folly of worldly wickedness, and the deep importance of those better things which now formed their highest privilege and consolation. Her husband, she said, had long since become a reformed character, and was now all she could wish as a Christian husband and father. This account was afterwards confirmed to me by others, who spoke of him as an honest, industrious, and most deserving

man; and I also found that he gave many sweet evidences of his sincerity as a professing Christian. He never entered upon his daily labours, nor lay down to rest at night, without reading a portion from the Bible, and gathering his little family around him for prayer and thanksgiving. He devoted all his leisure hours to the instruction of his children in reading, writing, and arithmetic; and many there are who might add their testimony to mine, that these children, who never failed in their attendance on the church services, behaved with a quietness and reverential attention, during the time of such services, that might prove them examples to many of our own more civilized families at home, who are educated with far higher advantages."

Our Authoress having spoken in the former part of her work of the actual condition, as she found it in 1836, of "the Prisoners of Australia," proceeds in her latter pages to trace up the fruits and consequences of crime to their usual source—the absence of Christian education, and the influence of bad example in early youth. Her attention is for the most part directed to that much-abused, much-neglected class of the community—female servants. Oh what have not masters and mistresses to answer for who voluntarily assume the responsibility of directing the conduct and forming the character of their dependants, and then deliberately abuse their sacred trust. May the solemn warning which the following affecting narrative, with which we conclude our notice of the volume before us, is calculated to convey, sink deep into the heart of every "ruler of a household," whose eye may light upon these pages.

"A young woman, named Amy, was the child of poor but honest parents, who had trained her well, and given her the best advantages which their situation admitted, in the sequestered village where her father was employed as a farm-labourer. His subsequent death dispersed his little family. Amy was much beloved in the circle of her lowly home as an artless and obliging girl, and was soon well recommended to the service of a lady who, finding 'London servants so *bad*,' resolved to try some from the country. Her mother, giving her child the best advice in her power, especially entreating her never to forget her religious duties nor the Sabbath-day, parted from her with an aching heart. That mother was soon after called from earthly cares, and the orphaned Amy was left with no other dowry than her own principles and industry. She entered her new home with the buoyant hopes of sixteen. All around her was splendour and luxury. Her mistress had herself engaged her during an accidental visit in the neighbourhood whence Amy was removed; and there was so much of sweetness and condescending kindness in the lady's manner, that the mother of Amy felt comforted in believing that her child would be under the authority and guidance of so gentle a spirit. But, alas! that spirit held little or no influence over the dependants of her own power. All authority was assigned to the housekeeper, and other upper servants of the establishment, while their mistress remained ignorant, not only of the tyranny exercised over the subordinate members of her household, but of the yet more important evil of vice and immorality practised without restraint by many of them. The poor girl soon found that 'all was not gold that glittered,'—that in entering service she had entered a world of wickedness, surrounded by examples such as she had been taught to shun. The account of her first Sabbath there was peculiarly touching, and it was related to me by her own lips, on her dying bed. Accustomed at home to

regard it as 'a day set apart,' she, as was her wont, dressed herself in all her best, to be in readiness for church, having with great alacrity got through all that she considered her due proportion of work. Meeting the housekeeper, she was immediately asked, 'Why, in the name of wonder, she was dressed out at that time of day!' and having simply answered that it was time to go to church, the housekeeper exclaimed, 'Bless the girl! why your betters cannot get to church, much less you, who are wanted high and low! Don't you know, child, we have more to do here on Sundays than on any other day of the week? so, like a good girl, go take off those nice clothes again, and do all you can to help us, both up stairs and down.' This was not spoken unkindly—far from it—but Amy thought of her mother and her home, and she wept bitterly. Some weeks elapsed, and she made no effort to do what seemed contrary to the general rule of her master's house, but rather became more reconciled to its ungodliness.

"From that hour may be dated the ruin of a girl well brought up, and naturally of a most docile temper. During the three years of her servitude she rarely went to Church; she never read her bible; she saw vice countenanced and religion set at nought, not only among her fellows, but also in the higher ranks of her master's household.

"It would neither be profitable nor pleasing to describe the scenes of deceit, dishonesty, and disorder to which this unfortunate Amy was continually exposed among her fellow servants. At length she was herself discovered by the housekeeper in the very act of a serious theft, and turned out of doors with only an hour's warning, friendless and dishonoured; without a home, without character, without resource.

"In that hour of dreadful destitution she was enticed into paths of yet deeper guilt and wretchedness! These circumstances at length acting upon a sensitive, and humanly speaking, not naturally depraved mind, she subsequently became deranged, and when I first saw her she was in a state of in-offensive idiocy, confined within the sick ward of her own parish workhouse. Her age was then not more than twenty; her countenance was then very sweet, although wan and pale. I gave her a shilling to buy some tea, which I understood was what she most enjoyed; but she threw it back to me again with a languid smile, and said 'Ladies shouldn't give poor girls money to live in fine houses—it was bad—*all bad!* They should let them go to Church, and make them good.'

"Her mental malady yielded as bodily disease increased. She spoke, however, but little, but seemed very patient and grateful to all who shewed her kindness. I was told that such was generally her state, except during the occasional paroxysms of aggravated fever, when she frequently became delirious, and then it was a piteous thing to hear her call for the mistress who 'had taken her away from her own dear mother to where all was death around her, both of body and soul.' A dissenting minister (I think a Wesleyan) was kind in administering to her temporal wants and to her spiritual consolation. At length poor Amy died—we humbly trust a sincere penitent, manifesting her simple dependence on Him who had not forsaken that 'child of many prayers,' although others had 'drawn her from his own blessed fold, and taught her to forsake his paths of peace' for those where peace could never be.'

MARIOLATRY ; or, *Facts and Evidences demonstrating the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome.*
Second edition. London: *Painter.* 1841.

“THOU shalt have NONE OTHER Gods but me,” was the first command which issued from the throne on Mount Sinai. To hearts sincerely bent to obey, this had been sufficiently distinct. But HE who gave it, knew the exceeding deceitfulness of the human heart ; and he therefore condescended so fully to enlarge and explain his command, as to leave no inch of ground on which the Tempter could plant his foot. If man would disobey, it should be in the face of the most explicit injunctions that language could possibly convey. “Thou shalt not make to thyself ANY graven image, nor the likeness of ANY thing that is in HEAVEN ABOVE, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not *bow down to them, nor* worship them ; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God,” &c.

With equal clearness did our Lord, when upon earth, reply to the Tempter ;—not refusing him divine honour merely on the score of his, Satan’s, unworthiness ; but referring at once to the all-inclusive command, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and HIM ONLY shalt thou serve.”

For three centuries, at least, did the Christian Church obey this command. The Roman See calls itself apostolic : does it justify this claim by setting up a totally different object of worship from any that the apostles ever knew ?

The present day has seen several instances of persons of education and intelligence, who have abandoned some sort of Protestant profession to join the Romish Church. To any of this class, that is, of persons capable of searching into and weighing evidence on a point of ecclesiastical history, we submit this point as worthy of their best consideration :—Let them search the records of our Saviour’s life : what one solitary word will they there find, ascriptive of any divine honour attaching to the Virgin ? “Woman, what have I to do with thee ?” “Who is my mother ? and who are my brethren ?” “He that doeth the will of my Father, the same is my mother, and sister, and brother.”

Let them pass on to the history of the apostles. A whole book is devoted to the actions and decisions of these founders of the infant Church. Long details are given, of the travels and sermons of Stephen, Philip, Peter, Barnabas, and Paul ; but only one incidental mention do we find of the blessed Virgin. The apostles

are particularized in the opening chapter, and it is said, "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication; with the women, and *Mary the mother of Jesus*, and with his brethren." Here is nothing of the "Queen of Heaven," nothing of the "Mother of God;" all that we find is a passing mention, along with "the women" and the "brethren." And this is the only allusion that we find, during all the years occupied by the Acts of the Apostles, to her who is now the goddess of the Romish Church! For

Let the epistles next be searched. There we have the great Apostle of the Gentiles, addressing himself to seven different Churches; and also to three personal friends. We have also the Beloved Disciple, in three letters; and him whom the Church of Rome styles "the Prince of the Apostles," in two; besides St. Jude; and St. James, the head of the Church at Jerusalem. And all these, writing at various periods, and on many different topics; and being all inspired by the Holy Spirit of God, to give to the Church, collectively, a complete manual of Christian doctrine and Christian precept,—all these, with one consent, entirely pass over the Virgin, as a person—and the honour due to her, as a subject,—which had never once entered their minds!

Once more;—if this be not enough, though indeed it ought to be, for where should we seek to learn who is the proper object of divine worship, but in the sacred scriptures;—if this be not enough, let us consult the early Church. Let us carefully examine the writings and the customs of the Church for the first two or three centuries. We have still extant the remains of what are called "the apostolic fathers," such as Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, &c., men who had enjoyed personal intercourse with the apostles. *Not one of these* so much as alludes to the subject of divine honour or worship due to Mary. Next we come to Irenæus, Justin, Cyprian, and the other writers of the third century: Still the same silence. Lastly, we find the episcopal historian of the Church, Eusebius, who records in the days of Constantine all the main features and leading events of the first three hundred years. And his narrative crowns and sums up the whole. The utter absence of any trace, in his work, of the worship of the Virgin, in any sort, or kind, or degree, fully warrants us in asserting, with entire conviction,—that for the first three centuries, at least, all such worship was utterly unknown. It is an human invention. We can point out when it arose, we can trace its gradual growth, and shew how it became at last established.

The question, then, is, Whether it can be reckoned among those things which man may add, or change, or fashion. No one denies

that a certain liberty of this sort must exist. In things indifferent or circumstantial, such as vestments, ceremonies, church music, and the like, men are not bound to continue for ever in one course :—But is this one of these immaterial things ?

Most unquestionably not ! What !—the placing a new name on the throne of heaven ;—the exaltation of a new person for the reception and the answering of prayer ;—the utter change in the whole divine economy of salvation ;—can this be reckoned a thing in which mortals may safely or lawfully interfere ? We trow not !

For, see how vast, how fundamental the change. Up to the times of Athanasius, at least, the Church had worshipped THE TRIUNE GOD. The Father, the Creator and upholder of all things ; the Son, the Redeemer of mankind ; the Holy Spirit, the author of life and holiness in the souls of the elect. To these alone, the Three Persons in the one eternal Godhead, the Church addressed her prayers ; and from these alone, she supplicated and expected salvation.

But the Church which exists at Rome, in these our times, has adopted a totally different system. Listen to her acknowledged head, the present Pope, Gregory XVI., who thus speaks in his Encyclical Letter, dated August 15th, 1832 :—

“ ‘ Having at length taken possession of Our see in the Lateran Basilica, according to the custom and institution of Our predecessors, We turn to you without delay, Venerable Brethren ; and in testimony of Our feeling towards you, We select for the date of Our letter this most joyful day on which We celebrate the solemn festival of the Most Blessed Virgin's triumphant Assumption into Heaven ; that She, who has been through every great calamity Our Patroness and Protectress, may watch over Us, writing to you [literally, ‘ may stand over Us propitious,’ ‘ *nobis adstet propitia*’], and lead Our mind by her Heavenly influence [literally, ‘ by her Heavenly inspiration,’ ‘ *cælesti afflatu suo*’] to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock.’ ”—(*Laily's Directory*, pp. 27, 28.)

Again :—

“ ‘ But that all' [these events, *omnia hæc*] may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise Our eyes [and hands, *oculos manusque*] to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our *greatest hope* [literally, ‘ confidence,’ ‘ *fiducia*’], yea *the entire ground of our hope*. May she exert her patronage to draw down an efficacious blessing on our desires, our plans and proceedings, in the present straitened condition of the Lord's flock.’ ”—(p. 28.)

Here we find the Virgin declared, by him who assumes to be Christ's vicerent upon earth,—to be the great sustainer and protectress of the Church ; the *entire ground* of its hope ; the Inspirer of wisdom ; the destroyer of error. Such is the most recent and most authoritative declaration of the light in which the Virgin is regarded by that body. But let us not rest solely on

one man's declaration. Gregory has only adopted and sustained the doctrines which have been promulgated by Rome for the last six hundred years.

Bonaventura was canonized by the Church of Rome, and his *Psalter of the blessed Virgin* was published in the Vatican edition of his works, under the sanction of Pope Sixtus V., and continues to be, up to this day, used, in various editions and abridgments, in most countries where Romanism prevails. We give a passage or two from its pages:—

IMITATION OF HABAKKUK.

"O thou Blessed [One], our salvation rests in thy hands. Remember our poverty, O thou pious [One]."

"Whom thou wilt, he shall be saved; and he from whom thou turnest away thy countenance, goeth into destruction."—(p. 21.)

IMITATION OF THE TE DEUM.

"We praise thee, the mother of God; we acknowledge thee, Mary the Virgin."

"All the earth doth worship thee, the spouse of the Eternal Father."

"To thee all angels and archangels: to thee thrones and principalities do service [or, wait upon thee]."

"Thou, with thy Son, sittest at the right hand of the Father."

"O Lady, save thy people, that we may be partakers of thy Son's inheritance."

"Vouchsafe, O sweet Mary, to keep us now and for ever without sin."

"Let thy great mercy be with us, because in thee, O Virgin Mary, do we put our trust."

"In thee do we hope, O sweet Mary: do thou defend us eternally."—(pp. 21, 22.)

Alphonso Liguori was canonized by the present pope, Gregory XVI., on the 26th of May, 1839. From his work entitled, "*The Glories of Mary*," we extract these passages:—

"Albertus Magnus says that Mary was prefigured by Queen Esther: of whom we read in the Holy Scripture, that she had been raised to the throne for the preservation of her brethren, the Jewish people. What Mordecai said to this woman, poor sinners may address to Mary: Imagine not, OMNIPOTENT and ever glorious *Virgin*, that God has elevated you to the dignity of queen, merely for your personal honour and advantage, but rather that you may mediate and obtain pardon for men, your offending brethren. And if Ahasuerus heard the petition of Esther through love, will not God, who has an infinite love for Mary, fling away at her suit the thunderbolts which he was going to hurl on wretched sinners?..... Will God reject her prayer? Is it not of her it was said, 'the law of clemency is on her lips?' Indeed, every petition she offers is as a law emanating from the Lord, by which he obliges himself to be merciful to those for whom she intercedes."

"Hope of the universe, my only hope! come to my assistance."

"Dispensatrix of the divine grace, *you save whom you please*; to you, then, I commit myself, that the enemy may not destroy me."

"St. Anselm, to increase our confidence in Mary, assures us that *our prayers will often be MORE SPEEDILY heard in invoking HER NAME, than in calling on that of Jesus Christ.*"

" Mary, says St. Bonaventure, is called the gate of heaven, because no one enters this blessed abode, without first passing through her."

" We, holy Virgin, *hope for grace and SALVATION from you* ; and since you need but say the word, ah ! do so, *you shall be heard*, AND WE SHALL BE SAVED."—(p. 26.)

Our space will not permit us to add more. We refer our readers to this little volume itself, which will well repay their perusal ; and in which we cannot help imagining that we trace the accurate and able pen of the Rev. T. Hartwell Horne.

Our final question is that with which we began. Is not this *another religion* from Christianity ? Do we not greatly mistake when we speak of these things as constituting a blemish merely,—a spot or deformity, on the face of " Catholic Christianity ?" Our Lord distinctly averred that " ye cannot serve God and Mammon." Equally true is it, that we cannot be saved by Christ *and* by Mary. If the Virgin be raised above the rank of a creature, she quickly becomes, what the present pope terms her, " our *greatest* hope ; yea, the *entire ground of our hope*." Let prayer be addressed to her *at all*, and the proportion quickly grows into that which is now universal in all Romish prayer-books, "*fifteen* Paternosters, and *one hundred and fifty* Ave Marys." We would tremblingly abstain from " judging our brother," and rejoice to see, in the case of Martin Boos and others, proofs that there are individuals in the Romish Church who are better than their system ; but amidst all this, we cannot so far neglect our duty as not to warn all who may be either primarily or secondarily within sound of our voice, that the Romish system itself is essentially *idolatrous*, and that " the Lord our God is a jealous God," who will not give his glory to another, neither his praise to graven images. The salvation of the soul is no light matter, and fearful indeed will be the surprise of those, who, having relied on MARY, rather than on JESUS, in this life, awake up in another, to discover, when it is too late, their fatal error.

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1841.

THE FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION, 1841. London. 8vo.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE PRAYER BOOK AND HOMILY SOCIETY, *during its Twenty-ninth Year*, 1840-1. London. 8vo.

PROBABLY among the readers of the *Churchman's Review* there are few questions which give rise to so much doubt and hesitation, as those which concern,—first, the expediency of promoting what are called “Protestant Associations;” and, secondly, the precise purposes to which such Institutions should be applied. We scarcely expect to be able entirely to clear away these doubts; but there appears to be a call upon us to devote some time and space to the consideration of the subject; and may God grant that we may be enabled to offer some suggestions, which shall tend to the advancement and defence of His truth.

The subject seems naturally to divide itself into two heads of inquiry:—1. Whether societies for the defence of gospel truth are allowable and expedient? and. 2. Whether the existing societies are well planned and constituted, and suited to effect their object?

On the first point, any difference of opinion that exists will generally be found to arise, not between persons fundamentally agreed, but between the two great parties which mainly divide the Church of England at this moment;—those who incline towards Rome on the one hand, and those who shrink from all contact

with her on the other. The chief objection to such associations is generally heard from those who are inclining towards the opinion, that "the Reformation must be given up;" and it takes the shape, ordinarily, of an allegation, that *the Church itself* is the only society needed, and the only society desirable, either for the propagation or the defence of the faith.

A few minutes' consideration, however, will suffice to shew us, that this objection, if it be good for anything, must rest upon an assertion of an inerrability and necessarily undecaying character in the Church. For, if it be granted that the Church may gradually decline from its first love and first faith, then the lawfulness of the use of means to prevent such declension is undeniable.

No such assertion, however, as that of the exemption of the Churches of these islands from the common liabilities of all things human can be maintained. The fate of the seven Asiatic churches, of Rome, and still later of Geneva, sufficiently proves, that though the Lord Jesus promised to be with His Church always—a promise which plainly includes a pledge, that he would always have a Church to be present with—yet he never guaranteed the safety of any local body of His worshippers, or pledged his word for the security of this or that provincial or national church. Each separate body of the kind may err; may fall into grievous heresy. And hence, since truth, before it is finally abandoned, is generally suppressed and partially hidden for a while, the expediency and lawfulness becomes evident, of checking and counteracting any tendency of the kind, by sedulously keeping fundamental truths in broad and open view.

Thus much of the *theory*. As a *practical* question, the case is, if possible, still clearer. The doctrines on which the English Church was based, by those who, in the sixteenth century, framed her Articles, compiled her Liturgies, and dictated her Homilies, are now systematically assailed by two distinct and independent confederacies. Rome herself, driven out in 1534, begins to nourish hopes of a re-conquest; and, at the call of our Spencers and Phillipses, gives, not only her prayers, but her men and her money to the work. She is deliberately, combinedly, and upon a settled plan assailing our Protestant Church. And she is greatly aided in this undertaking by a friendly movement within the camp. While Rome seeks to enter from without, a considerable faction has been formed within, who openly declare for her re-admission. They avow that they grieve and lament over the past alienation, and desire above all things the re-union of England with what they term "the Catholic Church."

Both these bodies of foemen act in confederacy. Neither of

the two so much as dreams of abandoning the well-understood advantage of combined action. They draw together, under each banner, all who have any agreement with their views; and they become formidable, chiefly from their confederacy and their organization.

In the face of these arrayed antagonists, what can be more obvious than the absolute necessity of meeting their assaults by a similar kind of organization? Beleagured by foes from without, and attempted to be betrayed by foes from within, nothing can be clearer than that every lawful means are required to defeat these combined attacks. That “the Church” itself, as some reasoners assure us, is the only lawful association, is a plain fallacy. “The Church,” practically, with us, is merely a mass of some fifteen thousand priests, and some millions of laymen, every one of whom adopts any fancy, and advocates any theory, that “seemeth good in his own eyes.” One Bishop subscribes to Socinian sermons, and invites Socinian preachers to his table; another quietly takes his place *after* a Romish intruding Bishop; and a third consents to form one of a board at which Socinians and Papists are to act conjointly and equally with himself. Obviously, in all this, there is no *protest* against any kind of error; there is no “Church” visible for any such purpose.

“Earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints” is an apostolical description of an unquestionable duty. That faith was *re-committed* to our care at the time of the Reformation. The word of God was then anew brought to light, from amid the dust which had been heaped upon it; new symbols and standards of faith were framed; and a Protestant character, a tone and meaning wholly opposed to Rome, was stamped upon the whole Establishment. All that was then done is now assailed, and openly threatened to be reversed. Rome declares it to have been rebellion, and that it requires repentance and reparation. The new Oxford party almost admit the charge, and shew no reluctance to profess and to render the sorrow and the restitution. The Protestantism of the Church is thus threatened and endangered. Defenders, of a character qualified to cope with these assailants, cannot be expected to appear individually, each bearing on his own shoulders the brunt and burden of the controversy. As associations are employed against the Church, associations must be employed in its behalf. The Romanists act in confederacy; the Romanizers act in confederacy; the Protesters against Rome must also act in confederacy. The *principle*, therefore, of our Protestant associations is clearly defensible. It is more, it is essentially necessary.

We have next to consider, whether the existing institutions of this class are wisely constituted and rightly organized.

The societies of this class, which have existed among us during several years past, are three:—The Prayer Book and Homily Society; the Reformation Society; and the Protestant Association.

The Prayer Book and Homily Society was formed in the year 1813. The objects which its founders had in view were, the revival of the doctrinal standards of the Church of England, which, at that time, were almost forgotten. In the far larger proportion of Common Prayer Books printed at that period, the Articles of the Church were omitted. The Book of Homilies was scarcely ever seen; its voice never heard in churches; its lessons never dispersed among the poor.

To that Society we mainly owe an entirely altered state of things. Never, we believe, is a Common Prayer Book now seen, without the Thirty-nine Articles appended to it. The Book of Homilies is now not merely on the shelves of thousands of Churchmen; but, in the form of Tracts, its pages are now distributed by three different Societies; and millions of these invaluable productions have been dispersed throughout the land. The restoration of sound Protestant faith and feeling which this Society has wrought, is of incalculable value and importance.

The Reformation Society arose in 1827. Not confining its views to the Church of England alone, or its course of action to defensive movements, it boldly carried the war into the enemies' camp, and assailed Popery openly and controversially, at once in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Its object was declared to be the diffusion of the religious principles of the Reformation; with the careful avoidance, nevertheless, of all political questions. Its labours have greatly tended to inform and direct the public mind, on the great distinguishing characteristics of Protestantism. Its chief hindrance has always consisted in the limited means placed at its disposal; a circumstance which must exist so long as it perseveres in its peculiar and narrow path, of cultivating Religious controversy, and yet eschewing all Political differences.

The last-formed of the three, the Protestant Association, has, from some peculiar circumstances, advanced more rapidly into public favor, and excited a larger degree of sympathy, than either of its elder sisters. It dates only from 1836; yet its last anniversary was the most numerously attended of all the various meetings which were assembled at Exeter Hall. It clearly possesses a considerable hold of the public mind; the chief topic of regret is, that the practical results of its labours are not very perceptible.

The thought has frequently occurred to our minds, of late, that

it would probably be greatly to the advantage of the cause which these three Societies have at heart, if some legitimate ground of union could be pointed out ; on which they might join their forces, and enter upon a course of action of a far more vigorous kind than heretofore.

It will be obvious to every one, that such an union, were it practicable, would tend to a vast economy of labour, and to an equally considerable increase of efficiency. The demand for active members of committees is now so great, and the pressure on the time of those who are desirous to serve the Church of Christ in this line of duty so considerable, as to render it certain that a consolidation of this kind must be greeted by those concerned, as in itself an important benefit.

A further indisputable advantage would arise from the presenting a broader and more intelligible front to the public eye. At present, perplexed with the differing and yet resembling claims of three independent *small* societies, multitudes of well-meaning persons subscribe to none. How easily may one who has little to bestow, hesitate between a Reformation Society and a Protestant Association, till he contributes, at last, to neither. Yet, if to such persons were presented one compact, comprehensive, and efficient body, “ set for the defence of the gospel” on the one hand, and for the refutation of error on the other, their sympathies would be excited, and a numerous mass of earnest supporters might be embodied.

There is much, too, in the several circumstances of these three societies which seems to favor such a plan. To begin with the Prayer Book and Homily Society. This, at first view, seems less akin to the object than either of the other two. But on a closer consideration, we find that the form it is now taking, is that of a Reformation Society.

Its primary objects have been already, in a great measure, achieved. It has revived the Articles and Homilies of the Church. The former, which, thirty years back, were usually omitted from our Prayer Books, are now always inserted. The latter, then almost unknown, are now universally read and distributed ; having, as one result of the labours of the Society, taken their place on the list of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. While, therefore, the Prayer Book and Homily Society deserves the greatest honor for what it has accomplished, in these respects,—still, these things *are* accomplished ; and the Society’s continuance is scarcely required on this account. Its later efforts have been the re-production of other works of the Reformation ; such as Jewell’s Apology, and portions of Foxe’s Acts and Monuments. Thus, as we have just remarked, it is becoming a *Reformation Society*.

The second Institution, which bears *this* name, is at present the least flourishing of the three; and yet, perhaps, it is the most important of all. It assails Popery in a direct and open manner, attacking all its fundamental errors, by publications, by lectures, and by discussions. We should deeply regret the loss of this Society. At present, however, the wind seems taken out of its sails by the loftier canvas of the Protestant Association. We doubt the necessity and expediency of maintaining any longer the distinction between these two institutions. The Reformation Society will not petition Parliament against the grant to Maynooth College, lest it should be charged with "meddling with politics!" The Protestant Association will. Consequently the public, who always shew a preference for the *practical* over the *theoretical*, exhibit the greater sympathy with the latter Society.

This institution, the last of the three, possesses, at this moment, in the warm support of such men as Mr. McNeile, Mr. Stowell, and Dr. Cooke, a great and very unusual amount of *power*. The chief subject of regret is, that this power is not brought to bear upon some practical measures, in such sort as to produce proportionate *results*. We find in Exeter Hall, in the month of May, a prodigious assembly. We find the people deeply moved. We proceed to a neighbouring church; the building will not admit one half of the thousands who throng thither. We say, What might not be done, if some attainable object were placed before all these people? But May passes away, summer comes on, we enquire, What results have followed all this enthusiasm? we can hear of none. True, indeed, it was well to inform and arouse the public mind. The speeches and sermons were not lost, if they did no more than this. But Englishmen are growing more and more "men of business;" and they will soon wax dissatisfied with a Society which holds meetings, and makes speeches, and does comparatively little else.

It is a fault, we humbly submit, in the Reformation Society, that it eschews politics. It is a fault, we also believe, in the Protestant Association, that it confines itself to politics. A society which is chiefly political loses the support of many good men, who fear too much contact with such questions. A society which is wholly doctrinal and controversial, loses the support of thousands, who prefer topics of more immediate interest. True religion in state affairs should be the *soul* of the *body*, and neither can bear to be for a moment disunited.

We would venture, therefore, to suggest the feasibility and expediency of forming one great society, by the union of these three. Let the Prayer Book and Homily Society contribute

its part; the editing and publishing the standards of the church, and the works of the Reformers. Let the Reformation Society continue, in a new co-partnership, its labours, in the production of new tracts, and the incitement of the clergy to new courses of lectures, and discussions, on the doctrines of Romanism. Let the Protestant Association bring its warmth, and zeal, and power, to aid in one great effort to maintain, and propagate, and enforce the doctrines of the REFORMATION, whether in Church or State, throughout the land.

Changes, indeed, such as this would be, ought not to be lightly called for; nor can they be easily effected. We shall be content to cast the recommendation “upon the waters,” in the humble confidence that if be for God’s glory, “it will be found after many days.” Yet we say not that it is either so startling, or of so questionable a character as to be hopeless of immediate adoption. The desirableness of *some* improvement in all these three institutions, none will question. All lament their lack of greater support, and express a feeling of disappointment that more sympathy is not shewn by Protestants for such matters. Their claims have been for years insisted on; many efforts have been made to excite a public interest; and still the whole sum annually contributed to these *three* institutions scarcely exceeds some paltry £3000 or £4000! Can it be supposed that if the effort were concentrated, and a broad and simple case presented to the public, the fund raised would be stinted to this mere trifle?

What then would be the objections raised to the proposed junction? To begin with the elder Society, we can easily imagine that some of its long-attached friends would say—We began a work of Christian edification, apart from controversy, and we shrink from plunging into a sea of contention and strife. We wish to circulate the Prayer Book and Homilies of the Church, and to quarrel with nobody. Why cannot we proceed as we have heretofore done? We reply to such, that nearly all the original grounds on which the formation of the Society was justified, have disappeared; and that, now, to keep up a distinct society merely to circulate Prayer Books and Homilies almost savours of a spirit of division.

In 1813, even to be admitted to join the *old* Prayer Book and Homily Society (that for *Promoting Christian Knowledge*) was by no means a matter of course. *Now*, a rejection never occurs. In 1813 the Prayer Books ordinarily on sale were generally without the Articles of the Church. *Now*, such an omission is never observed. In 1813 the Homilies of the Church were almost forgotten; the Christian Knowledge Society doing nothing to circulate them

among the poor. *Now*, an abundant supply is always kept in the depository of that institution. Thus, nearly all the motives which compelled the sincere and orthodox Churchmen to desiderate and support a new society are gone; and the keeping up of two establishments to do the work of one is almost an useless expence. If it be observed, as it may be observed with truth, that the Prayer Book and Homily Society exerts itself most laudably in promoting translations of the Liturgy abroad, and in supplying our Navy at home, the obvious remark is, that there is no ground to suppose that any of these good works would be rejected or neglected by the Christian Knowledge Society, if they were properly brought before its governing Committee. We feel, therefore, that this is a case for what it is the fashion to call "*Church Union*."

The difficulties with respect to the other two Societies are of a minor kind. The Reformation Society eschews politics; the Protestant Association professes to take up this neglected ground.

But is the difference, at present, much more than in name? So indiscernible is the distinction, often-times, that we doubt whether, at this moment, it exists more than in imagination. We observe the Protestant Association frequently holding meetings to explain and to objurgate divers doctrines and practices of Popery. In this it clearly trenches upon the ground of the Reformation Society. On the other hand, could not the managers of this latter Society easily bring their minds to adopt a petition to Parliament against Maynooth; just as the Anti-Slavery Society adopts a petition against opening the Sugar Trade to Cuba, without feeling that they thereby are entering into *party* politics?

We believe, then, such a change to be practicable; and we are quite certain, that, if practicable, it is desirable. Difficulties, doubtless, more, and probably more serious than those which we have pointed out, may exist; but we respectfully recommend at least the *consideration* of the matter to the managers of these Societies, in the hope, that, by such an union, we might gain a large and powerful body, constituted, and determined, to defend the Protestantism of the Church of England against all gain-sayers.

BRIEF MEMOIR AND ACCOUNT OF THE SPIRITUAL LABOURS OF THE LATE MRS. STEVENS. By her SISTER. London: *Seeley and Burnside*. 1841.

Not for many years, we are inclined to believe, has a volume of biography issued from the press on which it is so difficult to pronounce a judgment at once discriminating, impartial, and moderate, as on the memoir now before us. Whatever may have been the desire of the author, her work *does* "claim the *public* attention," and though she might have preferred to address "the circumscribed circle" of her sister's admirers and friends, it will be found that the same causes which operated to bring her deceased relative into notoriety whilst living, will tend to attract a more general, and perhaps promiscuous, observation to these records of her life and labours. The peculiarity of the whole case will excite curiosity, and widely different will be the estimates which readers of different classes will form of that case. The flippant, we cannot but foresee, will find abundant materials for sarcasm, and it may be for scorn. The enthusiastic may regard (as it would seem some did regard) this devoted woman as a prophetess, "yea, and more than" a prophetess. Between these extreme and therefore erroneous opinions it is obviously our province to mediate; and that we may not expose ourselves to misapprehension, a few simple and decided terms shall at once convey the impression which has been left by the perusal of this remarkable volume. It affords, we think, a singular illustration of a moral phenomenon, which in itself is not perhaps so singular. It presents the biography of a person whose life was one continuous error of judgment, but at the same time one unvarying example of devotedness of heart, and holiness of practice. We would not underrate that error, or its tendencies and consequences; on the contrary, we are about to indicate and protest against it. We dare not, however, deny that it was, in very many instances, most wonderfully overruled for good; or that the character which thus evinced the frailty of humanity, was at the same time eminently spiritual and exemplary.

Mrs. Stevens is here set forth not only as a "mother," but a *teacher* "in Israel." Constant reference is made to "the flock" she tended, "the vineyard" she cultivated; she is compared to "Miriam," and it is all along assumed that a peculiar "dispensation of the gospel was committed to her." Many, judging from *results*, real and apparent, have been willing to concede this point; and could it be once established on sober and *scriptural*

principles, we freely admit that a pattern is here exhibited of ministerial zeal and affection, of diligence and single-mindedness, of method, tact, and aptness to teach, which many of those who are "lawfully called and sent" might do well to imitate. As it is, we do not blush to avow the having gathered more than one practical and professional hint from this uncanonical source.

Having thus informed the uninitiated reader *what* Mrs. Stevens was, it may not be amiss to take a brief glance at those circumstances which combined to make her such. From a child she evidently possessed strong feelings and a strong determination. A constrained marriage in very early youth, when every impulse was at its height, resulting as it seems in bitter affliction, "led to an endeavour to find in *impassioned* exercises of religious tendency, some support and repose of an overcharged mind." Here we think is a key to much that follows. The character of her piety and of her early labours savoured strongly of this reaction of the affections; indeed it is frankly admitted, that there was "a great mixture of what was still purely natural" in the zeal of her first love, and "excesses" in her first attempts as a spiritual instructress. Having early acquired a powerful influence over the clergyman with whom, through her sister's marriage, she was afterwards so long and intimately connected, her ardent mind at once employed the license thus obtained, by seeking a multiplicity of objects on which to energize. The girls' day school, and the Sunday schools, were among her earliest and most appropriate spheres of exertion; but it was whilst thus becomingly and efficiently engaged, that the narrow line which forms the boundary of strict propriety was, as we apprehend, *first* overstepped. Much may be pleaded in extenuation of the course described in the following passage, and the motive is almost above suspicion; but still, if "the adults" alluded to were of a different sex from those "teachers," we feel that *then* the barrier of female delicacy was invaded, and that *then* was the moment for that determined defence which afterwards became nearly impossible.

That the course was in itself hazardous, appears to be conceded at the close of the extract:—

"Many adults came to listen to the new teachers; the numbers increased, surrounding and crowding the classes, and eagerly listening to the simple exposition of the scripture proofs of the catechetical subjects; nor did this singular attraction either surprise or alarm us; we had but one object, not to be heard, but to *win souls*, and thus the danger was escaped of being 'puffed up,' or of thinking it any thing more than the attraction of the *word*. We had learnt, and I would fain hope, practically applied, that 'in ourselves dwelleth no good thing.' The entire corruption of man by the fall, and his full recovery by redemption in the blood and righteousness of Jesus Christ, were the chief and favourite themes of our hearts, and by expatiating on

them to others, they became the more sealed on our own mind. I trace in this a providential shield, which through grace saved us from many dangers, in which, but for preserving mercy, we might have made shipwreck of our faith."—(p. 20.)

The *progress* in this course is thus developed:—

" Writing for friends, I need not say much on a subject they so well know, of the peculiar attraction that ever accompanied her in her engagements; so that whatever class she held, or course of teaching she was going through, she was always followed by a great number of listeners, the most of them seriously desirous to receive the instruction, to bestow which she was so remarkably qualified. She had a power of perception, an ardent affectionate manner, an earnest and single purpose, and her words were accompanied with an energy that enforced conviction and informed the understanding, God giving both the talents and a large blessing on their use. The human mind loves these easily-acquired advantages; and as one subject opened out a desire to hear a second, it naturally followed that many adult hearers became generally regular attendants on her nights of instruction for the rising and maturing classes of young people; besides which, our vicinity to Harrogate sometimes brought strangers—at first few, and only occasionally. Such as had an interest in schools naturally came to see those of the neighbourhood; others, on hearing of them, as wishing for something new on a day when there was an obligation to suspend the pleasures of the place; some from mere curiosity; so that after some time there was always an increasing but changing number.

" For many reasons it was unpleasant, and she frequently endeavoured to exclude strangers, considering them an intrusion on the young people for whom she specially laboured, occupying much room, and endangering their simplicity and openness. She never liked publicity; she tried to keep her doors closed, appointed a porter, adopted tickets, without which she refused admission; but all was in vain, and put aside by the determination of those who were bent on hearing, and through the extreme inconvenience also of keeping guard at the door of a school requiring to be open for the reception of the appointed classes. The desire still increased; she thus became more known; through which many of her most valued and endeared friendships were formed with those who sought her communion;—could it be otherwise? —(pp. 49—51.)

The *consummation* of the course may be gathered from another extract:—

" The meeting-room (a room built and licensed expressly for the purpose) is filled with benches having a kind of back to them, the seats across the room, and raised benches at the side, as in the rooms where the societies meet in London—as the Prayer-Book and Homily Society, &c.

" I think the instrument is a small organ, and very near it was a covered chair rather raised; windows were in the end and sides of the room.

" At seven o'clock Mrs. Stevens placed herself at the instrument and gave out the hymn, reading two lines, as in some chapels, and then singing, and so on. This *voice cannot be described nor yet imagined*; I have tried imagination often on the subject, and will not *attempt description*, but will briefly say, in giving out the hymn, it is low, that is, soft, but to me most distinct and sweet in a peculiar strain of sweetness, a tone to which as yet I can find no resemblance in things past. What then is this voice when it rises into energy, varies its expression, bears witness, pauses, pleads?—but I am anticipating.

" The singing of the hymn and accompaniment were unutterly beau-

tiful to me, and you would say (I am sure of your judgment) angels sing thus—

Thou very Paschal Lamb,
Whose blood for us was shed,
Through whom we out of Egypt came,
Thy ransom'd people lead.

All was full, solemn, sweet, a strain that seemed bound to the heaven of heavens, and would surely penetrate God's secret place.

"All this is needful, therefore it is given; for ordinary powers, &c., and anything less than the *concentration* of the individual (if I may so speak) in *her work*, could not bear out a thing like this.

"The subject of exposition was Isaiah xiv. 28—32, that is, to the end. The opening of the subject, referring both to the opposers of the Lord and the people of the Lord, &c., . . . the times of the prophet and our own times, and was powerfully interesting. But who shall describe the *after-strain* that gradually arose out of this? The animation of the appeals—the closeness of the application—the fulness of the witness—the upper and nether springs wide open to the thirsty soul—for the fervent spirit laboured to unfold the whole counsel of God, and *every truth we* recognise, held sound and sure in the Scriptures, had its due measure of attention.

"I will give you some of the words spoken, at more leisure, and only refer you now to some Scriptures cited and taken in connection. Psalm cii. 13—18; Ezekiel xxxiv.; Rev. vii. 9, &c. Look on only these, and imagine the connexion and references they supply. She spoke two hours, rising in power, &c., until the very close, and having only her Bible in her hand."—(pp. 319—321.)

This last passage is from the pen of one who states, "My questioning was solely on *scripture* ground." By what *scriptural* arguments those doubts were satisfied and removed does not appear. We, at least, can discover nothing beyond the fascination of an harmonious voice, the peculiarity of the scene, and the unquestioned gifts and piety of the lecturer. It becomes, therefore, the more important to examine the "scriptural ground" of vindication adopted by Mrs. Stevens *herself*; and here, we confess, is, to our mind, emphatically the weak part of the whole case.

Had a course in itself so peculiar, and productive, as we are bound to admit, of such remarkable results, been defended *merely* on the ground that she was "singularly called and endowed"—there would have been fewer grappling-points for the opponent to seize; but candour compels the acknowledgment, that it is impossible to read the published Apology, to which we refer, without subscribing to the wisdom of the prohibition, "I suffer not a woman to teach." Mrs. Stevens in addition to her other indefatigable labours, published a commentary (consisting of twenty octavo volumes) on the entire scriptures! We have never seen the work, but have no doubt that it would be eminently devotional, and, on that account, possibly useful. We must, nevertheless, venture on the remark that, except it be written in a totally different vein from the document in question, it would be a very unsafe guide as

respects the interpretation, and therefore the legitimate application of scripture. On the passage, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak," the comment is:—

"The abuse committed by the women does not appear even an *attempt* to *teach* in this instance; it is evident they were, on the contrary, engaged in *asking questions*, as the thirty-fifth verse proves; and their error was, intruding their curious inquiries at an improper season, and in an improper spirit, interrupting the general order of the assembly; and the direction given them is, to keep silence in the churches, and to *put their questions at home*, it being disgraceful to them to lose sight of the modesty and decorum becoming their sex, and the reverence due in the ordinances of the Lord. This passage, therefore, is entirely irrelevant to the subject."—(p. 59.)

Did it never occur to the Vicar of Knaresborough to remind his valued relative, that even on her own *interpretation* of the words, another *application* of them might be made, and, in fact, had long since been made? Tertullian speaking of certain *heretical* assemblies observes, "They allow women to teach and dispute in them, expressly against the rule of the apostle, which is so far from allowing them to *teach*, that it does not allow them to *ask questions publicly* in the Church."

On 1 Tim. ii. 12, "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence," we have the following observations:—

"In this Scripture there is no mention of public meetings, churches, or religious assemblies: the prohibition stands simply, 'I suffer not a woman to teach,' *where, or how, or what* she is not suffered to teach are considerations *added* to the text, by those who choose to make it bear upon public ministrations; in fact, it does not afford any advantage for, or against, this question. Suppose we take the prohibition *independently* of the context: what is the necessary consequence? It follows of course that a woman is not suffered to teach in *any* way—at any time—or any person. 'I suffer her not to teach.' We cannot reasonably admit such an interpretation, which would go to the destruction of all female efforts for the improvement of children, &c., either in things religious or merely intellectual. We must therefore taken it *with* the context; and doing so, we necessarily come to this solution of the passage, the teaching prohibited by the apostle is that of arrogantly dogmatizing and dictating to 'the man' (*or husband*, as the same word is rendered, 1 Cor. xiv. 35), as if in the seat of supreme authority—*usurping authority*; and this not, as is evident, in subjects exclusively *religious*, but in the general deportment and practice through life."—(p. 60.)

Surely a mere passing examination ought to convince any candid mind that the whole of the chapter alluded to is strictly *liturgical*, designed to instruct the young bishop "how he ought to behave himself in the house of God," and distinctly enjoining, that whilst "*men*" (rather "*the men*" to denote the opposition of sexes) should "pray," (and they only) "every where" or "in every place,"—i. e., in every Church, "*the woman must learn in silence.*" This last clause is not referred to in the Defence, though

it forms the immediate context, and conclusively proves that the design was to regulate the woman's behaviour *in public*. At home, when in the society of her husband, there was not the same reason for "shamefacedness;" nor is it quite evident how she could *learn* of him if she continued *in silence*.

The Apology, which is in the epistolary form, proceeds:—

"Do you now, my friend, desire satisfaction as to the authority by which a female justifies her *scriptural* appointment to teach? I rejoice that you ask it, because the testimony is *abundant*; and from no parts of Scripture more plentiful than from the writings of that very apostle who is quoted *against* the liberty. But it will be more in order to begin our testimony from the more distant period of the Old Testament dispensation."—(p. 61.)

Accordingly, having very justly premised that "prophecy," in scripture phraseology, is not always "restricted to the peculiar gift of *predicting* the dispensations of God," but may be explained of "building up the Church in all sound *doctrine*," the next step is to enumerate the several "holy women" who are said, in the Old Testament, to have possessed this gift. Thus Deborah, Miriam, Huldah, are all enlisted in the service of the argument, forasmuch as they are all styled "prophetesses;" the inference of course being that they, in common with Mrs. Stevens, were engaged in "building up the Church in sound doctrine."

But let us not be suspected of, in the slightest degree, colouring the matter; these are the observations on the last instance:—

"The king, the princes, the chief rulers, and even the high priest, went *up to her* for counsel, as to one established in authority, and sent to them by the Lord, 2 Kings xxii. 12—20. These are striking examples of the *lawfulness* of a woman's teaching, sufficient to silence for ever the plea that it is contrary to a divine command: for God is of one mind, and if it was lawful in the Old Testament dispensation, it must continue to be so in the New, for the Scriptures are not contradictory in their voice."—(p. 63.)

In confirmation of this last position the prediction (Joel ii. 28, 29) is referred to with these remarks:—

"It contains a promise of the outpouring of the Spirit, in consequence of which '*daughters shall prophesy*.' And lest there should be any doubt remaining, it is added, 'Upon your *handmaids*, in those days, I will pour out my Spirit.' Let the apostle Peter be the interpreter of this promise, and observe the *times* in which he declares it to be fulfilled, Acts ii. 16—18.'"—(p. 63.)

"Precisely so," we rejoin, "observe the *times*"—the times when prophecy was merely one of many extraordinary endowments, such as the gifts of tongues, gifts of healings, &c., &c.—the times when "young men saw visions," and "old men dreamed" inspired "dreams." In like manner, because Anna prophesied in the temple, and Philip's virgin-daughters at Cæsarea—because Priscilla joined her husband in expounding the way of God more perfectly to

Apollos—because “Tryphena and Tryphosa laboured in the Lord,” and “the beloved Persis laboured much in the Lord”—because the apostle speaks of some women as his “fellow-labourers”—above all, because “in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female ;” (!) *therefore*, we are presented with “sufficient evidences for the scriptural right of a female to teach,” and, in short, Mrs. Stevens’ homiletic labours were “decent and in order.”

Only one more fallacy shall be glanced at, not because we have a pleasure in dwelling upon so weak a point, but because it is one which evidently misled many of Mrs. Stevens’s hearers, some of those hearers (*proh pudor !*) being clergymen of the Established Church. It is added :—

“Allow me to remark, that a spirit of holy caution should also be observed, lest haply whilst resisting and vilifying the female worker we should be found fighting against God. Of this we may say, ‘If it be of men,’ that is, if the female intrude herself unappointed and uncalled of God to her service, ‘it will come to nought, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it.’ —(p. 65.)

Admirable as was the remark of Gamaliel, when applied to the particular case under his consideration, we must take good heed how and to what extent we generalize the observation, else it might be adduced to fortify heresies and apostacies not a few.

It would not, however, be fair to pass over what is really the only part of the argument which has even the appearance of strength. We are referred to 1 Cor. xi. 5, 6, 10, 13, “where,” it is said, “St. Paul, without any hesitation as to the lawfulness of a woman’s teaching, expressly shews her *how* she is to discharge her public calling as a teacher and to the glory of God.” It must be admitted that this single passage presents, at first sight, a difficulty as compared with the two express prohibitions already alluded to. Suppose, now, that there were no probable mode of solving the difficulty, what would be the principles of interpretation that should guide us in this case? Here is, on the one hand, no express injunction that a woman *shall* teach ; but, on the contrary, there are two express prohibitions *against* her teaching. Surely, then, there will not be much hesitation to receive one of two solutions—either, 1st, that the single apparent *permission* refers to some particular instance, such as that of immediate inspiration which constituted the *exception*, whereas the repeated and absolute *prohibitions* indicate the *rule*—or else, 2nd, that in that individual passage, the apostle is merely exposing the gross indelicacy (according to eastern notions) in the mode of performing certain acts, not *in themselves* unlawful, but which at a subsequent stage of his argument, he *pronounces* such, by virtue of his inspired authority.

As to the argument, from peculiarity of gifts, and eminency of graces, we would say—let them be exercised (according to the spirit of apostolical precept) in their acknowledged and appropriate sphere. Let those who are so endowed, teach, in the first instance, infants and children, and then, as they ripen in years and experience, “the younger women also.” Is not this “ample scope and verge enough” for all the devotedness and all the talents that the sex (with its admitted superiority in piety) is likely to command?

In whatever degree the question may be accounted debateable, (though we cannot for a moment so regard it,) in that proportion the voice of antiquity may be admitted to have some slight degree of weight. Now, whilst it was the frequent practice in *heretical* Churches for women to preach, and even to be ordained as bishops and presbyters, in no one *catholic*, i.e., *orthodox* Church was it ever permitted,—nay, the Council of Carthage has this express decree against the innovation, “Let not a woman, however learned or holy, (*quamvis docta et sancta*) presume to teach men in a public assembly.”

To all this grave argumentation on our part, we know some who would turn round upon us with, “Did you ever hear Mrs. Stevens?” And on our answering in the negative, would say, “Ah, I thought so, or you could never have formed such a judgment;” and this would be the Q. E. D. to which we should be expected to succumb. It is the style of reasoning according to which it is said, in reference to the failings of some particular beauty,

“Look in her face and you forget them all;”

And we should be very willing, (truth and conscience permitting,) to learn logic in the same school.

Apart, however, from the stringent and, as it seems, inevitable conclusions to which a sober exercise of judgment and a determination to be guided by what is right rather than by what is specious, conduct us, it can hardly be denied that there was in the case under consideration much that was attractive, and shall we say seductive, to a spiritual mind. In addition to the almost irresistible charms of a “sweet voice” and a “flowing eloquence,” there was evidently a conviction on the part of this extraordinary teacher that she was sent from God—there was moreover great textual acquaintance with the lively oracles—a remarkable aptness in detecting a latent, spiritual, and perhaps mystical meaning, in the minutest fragments of scripture—much of “lucid order” in her arrangement of subjects—and above all, a wonderful degree of

what is termed power and unction, the fruit undoubtedly in great measure of constant and fervent devotion, but in combination with natural enthusiasm and singular concentration of character. The instructions of such an individual, continued with unremitting energy throughout a period of thirty-six years, could hardly fail, in the nature of things, to produce extensive and striking results. This was so eminently the case, as to form, both to her own mind, and to many others, a sufficient vindication of all irregularity in the means employed. A palpable moral change effected in the population of a manufacturing town—conversions beyond the power of calculation—numerous death-bed testimonies to the blessing derived through this unwonted channel—hundreds of superior rank and attainments, who when visiting Harrogate were refreshed, quickened, strengthened, edified—above all, faithful and devoted men, her spiritual children now labouring in the Lord's vineyard, and in some important spheres—these afford so many indications that "the good Lord" will "pardon" and accept what is done with a single desire for his glory, and in simple dependance on his grace, notwithstanding much real imperfection, much want of judgment, and much irregularity of manner. Be it observed, however, that this admission does not at all affect the question of *right* or *wrong*. That must be referred "to the law and to the testimony." It only suggests the duty of glorifying the wisdom and mercy of God, who

"From seeming evil still educes good."

The whole case, as one of *decency, order, subordination*, must stand upon its *own merits*. Unhappily, this is a distinction which, though simple in itself, few have the discrimination to make, or the candour to allow.

Yet further, our duty requires us to point out, that the results above adverted to, great and blessed though they be, were by no means of an unmixed character. Evil to a considerable extent blended with them. Frequent excitement and confusion in the parish, occasioned by every now and then a refractory curate, who presumed to question the propriety of the existing regime, and to quote the text, "I suffer not a woman to teach"—the putting every such *ordained* minister, however conscientious his opposition might be, in a false position—the esteeming him, and by necessary consequence, though not by actual declaration, causing him to be esteemed, as a persecutor, influenced by wounded vanity, self-reproved by the superior zeal and mortified by the superior success of his *unauthorized* fellow-worker—the bringing her too-compliant relative, the vicar, into ill-odour and frequent collision

with his ordinary—the accounting that ordinary, and occasioning him to be accounted, as arbitrary, prejudiced, and oppressive—all this, to our mind, is evil of so grave a character, as to weigh very heavily in the opposing scale, when even mere results are to be estimated.

From all, however, that is so questionable in the mode of employing her spiritual gifts, it is indeed refreshing to turn to the contemplation of the real spirituality of her mind, and the striking beauty of her character. His must be a narrow mind, and his a cold heart, that is not won, despite his prejudices (we had almost said his judgment), into unfeigned admiration and tender sympathy.

Forgetting for a time her *assumption* of the ministerial office, is there not something for those who *lawfully* bear it, to learn from such a passage as the following:—

“ For those who came out with more decided evidence of a work of grace on the heart, she had the same persevering attention. She knew the scenes and temptations to which they were exposed, and how their very promise made them the more conspicuous objects for Satan’s devices. As a gentle nurse she nourished them; and whilst she rebuked the inconsistencies of inexperience and weakness, strove to confirm them in their faith, and direct their course. She used to assemble them at stated periods, at one of which, preparatory to a day for the communion at the Lord’s table, under some particular impressions in behalf of the little flock, she addressed them with the assurance how near they all were to her heart, and that she had been that day *four hours on her knees in prayer for them, having remembered them all individually, with their particular interests and necessities, at the throne of grace*. No wonder that she was enriched with such an influential persuasion from above! One who knew her private habits, and was in closest intimacy with her, describes her at this season as having, in a retired recess in her room, two mats, on one of which she knelt, and on the other rested her prostrate head; and adds, that she has often there remained for two hours in uninterrupted intense devotion. I have seen her often leave her retreat as one who had been washing her Saviour’s feet with tears. At other times as one who had been on the mount with her Lord. She was truly a wrestler with the Lord when seeking his blessing.”—(pp. 34, 35.)

Then again how exemplary her conduct in every relative capacity as a child, a parent, a sister, a mistress, a friend! We exceedingly regret that our limits debar us from the pleasure of transcribing one or two passages, in which her portrait is so beautifully, because so simply, truthfully, and affectionately sketched. We might instance her attendance on her dying parents—her manner of magnetizing (so to speak) the wild “children in the market-place”—her love for animals and flowers, so sweetly natural, so truly spiritualized—her composure and fortitude in preparing for and undergoing a most painful surgical operation. These little outlines are irresistibly attractive, and we think that few will read some of them with tearless eyes.

Just one or two tiny paragraphs we *must* add, as eminently graphic, when we bear in mind her peculiar natural gift (that voice of melody), and her ardent devotion of spirit:—

“Often have I heard her buoyant spirit animated at midnight, after her return from her laborious exertions in teaching, break out in sudden strains of sacred singing, accompanied by her dear daughter, whose chord was in unison with hers; her heart appeared as if it could not be weary in spiritual service.”—(p. 163.)

Again the journey to London, where the operation, above alluded to, was performed, is thus described:—

“We left our home on Tuesday, October 8. Our journey was performed in as long stages for the day as her strength would possibly admit, on account of the evident necessity to reach town as soon as possible. Never can I forget her meek demeanor; propt in a corner of the carriage with pillows, she most generally withdrew her mind from all outward objects; throwing a large silk handkerchief over her head, she was abstracted, and spent her time in silent meditation; yet two or three times she and her daughter gently sung a hymn together. Whenever her countenance was uncovered by a breeze of air raising her handkerchief, you saw the intenseness of her mind, and the expression of heavenly devotion.”—(p. 229.)

Once more, in the closing scene of all, how irresistibly touching this twin group of the dying mother, and her own daughter in the faith!—

“On her bed of pain she was active for good to others, and felt, as long as she could render any spiritual service, it was her duty and her delight. Nor would she suffer any care for her to interrupt the work in which her beloved daughter was engaged. To the last, when it was evident her mortal life was near its close, she would not permit her to relax on account of her state. She felt the value of souls, and of the administering the care and nurture of the gospel. Notwithstanding the pleasure and comfort she had in the tender and welcome attention of her dear child, another self, yet with the same self-denying zeal she had ever practised, she yielded all personal considerations to the good of the living. She *looked* her *blessing* as she departed on her duty, and glowed with animated pleasure on her return.

“She frequently had her kneeling on her bed, to put down arrangements for her own classes, which she bore in mind with a mother’s care, though absent; and many times they would together gently sing a hymn when they had concluded the engagements.”—(p. 242.)

We have now discharged our task, anxiously and conscientiously; and in conclusion are bound to say, that as the volume is published, it *may* be read with real profit—it *must* be read with deep interest.

The peculiarity of mental constitution—the exhibition of real graces, though developed on wrong principles and in a false position—the bright array of ministerial gifts—the still brighter display of ministerial virtues, in one whose exercise of them involved an unscriptural usurpation of the office—the unwavering faith, the devoted zeal, the affectionate temper, and the extended usefulness

here portrayed—present a study of human nature and character which the philosopher, the Christian, and the Christian minister may do well to contemplate with attention.

It is announced in the preface, that the Memoir is to be followed by a volume of letters. If we had the slightest influence with the editor of that forthcoming volume, we should earnestly entreat her to submit them to the perusal and revision of some really sober, spiritual, but not too *partial* friend. Such a course appears desirable in reference to the memory of the departed, the interests of the Church, and the glory of God.

REMARKS ON THE NECESSITY OF ATTEMPTING A RESTORATION OF THE NATIONAL CHURCH. By the Rev. W. GRESLEY, Prebendary of Lichfield. London: *Rivingtons*. 1841.

AN ENQUIRY INTO THE POSSIBILITY OF OBTAINING MEANS FOR CHURCH EXTENSION WITHOUT PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS. By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A. of Worcester College, Oxford. London: *Rivingtons*. 1841.

CONSIDERING that the title page of this pamphlet is decorated with the respectable and respected name of Mr. Gresley, we were somewhat surprised to open upon a dedication, not conceived in the best possible taste, and expressed, we might almost say, in the worst possible language. "These pages," says the author, "are respectfully inscribed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, in the hope that *they* will pardon the plainness with which *they* are written, and with the earnest request that *they* will bestow on *them* *their* candid consideration." If there were as much confusion in the pamphlet, as there is in the dedication, between the Prelates and the pages, that for which their Lordships' pardon should be rather solicited would be the very opposite of plainness; happily for us reviewers, however, this is not the case, and we think we apprehend with tolerable accuracy whatever is *expressed* in Mr. Gresley's pages, though what is *implied* may occasionally be the subject of conjecture. We will proceed, therefore, to a summary of the author's notions on what he calls "Church Restoration," discarding, as we perceive, the invidious phrase,

Church Reform ;—and, in so doing, we will endeavour to give some degree of palpability to a phantom which is continually flitting through Mr. Gresley's pages, that of *primitivity*. When he talks of the "restoration" of the National Church—the bringing it back to a state in which it existed at some former period—a question naturally arises, what this period of primitive purity really was? Shall we find it in the days of the proud, arrogant, and presumptuous Prelate whom it is now the fashion at Oxford to designate "Saint Thomas of Canterbury;" or in the halcyon times of the Dunstons and the Odos; or in the age of Saint Augustine himself, receiving the deputation of British clergy with a hauteur but too portentous of the domineering spirit which was to be manifested by the papacy in after years? We shall endeavour, as we advance, to bring this question to an issue; and if we can accomplish this, we shall acquire thereby a clue to certain passages, which assuredly do not require any apology, even to Bishops and Archbishops, for the "plainness" with which they are written.

"Our Church," says Mr. Gresley, and he says truly, "has long been only in name a National Institution, and it has become a vain boast to call ourselves a Christian people." An institution can only deserve the name of national which is commensurate with a nation's wants; and a people cannot be justly called Christian, of whom a considerable portion are not even baptized into the name of Christ, while of those who are, a fearful majority bear that holy name only to disgrace, or rather only to profane it. Pastoral superintendence requires to be made effective throughout the land; and in order to this, there ought to be one minister to a thousand people, and so indeed there is—for if we take the population of England at 15,000,000,* we shall at this rate obtain a body of 15,000 clergy, which is below, rather than above, the real number. The want, therefore, according to Mr. Gresley, is not the numerical deficiency of clergy, but the absence of proper distribution; one clergyman being assigned to a parish of forty or fifty, and sometimes no more than one to five, ten, or even twenty thousand souls. There is, however, another and a prior deficiency, which we will state in Mr. Gresley's own words, and until this be supplied, there is little hope of any real, extensive, or enduring improvement in superintendence strictly parochial:—

"First, then, as regards the highest order of clergy—the *Bishops*. Is the present number sufficient to oversee the population of this nation? The inquiry on this head might be carried into the field of historical research, and might begin by a comparison of the number of souls placed under the spiritual superintendence of English Bishops in the present century, with the

* Mr. Palmer says 16,000,000.

population of the same dioceses in earlier periods, or with the average extent of dioceses in other parts of Christendom. Some light might be obtained from the example of the Apostles. The well-known opinion of the reformers of the sixteenth century, as to the necessity of an increased number of Bishops, even in their time, might also be considered.

"Respecting the comparative state of other countries with our own in this respect, I have been favoured by a friend, on whom I have perfect reliance, with the following statement:—

"Italy, Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia, with a population of at least 24 millions, have in round numbers 270 sees.

"We, with 16 millions in England and Wales, have only 26.

"Greece, with less than a million population, has 36 sees.

"France, before the Revolution, had 145 sees, and 28 millions.

"Spain, 60 Bishops, and 10 or 12 millions.

"Romanists in Ireland, 64 or 7 millions, and 30 Bishops.

"American church (less than a million) has 20 Bishops.

"Ancient Asia Minor, about twice as large as England, had 400 sees."

"From which statement it will appear, that a single Bishop in these several countries has had the following numbers committed to his spiritual charge:—

In Italy, Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia	88,000
In Greece	27,000
In France, before the Revolution.....	193,000
In Spain	183,000
In America	50,000
In Ancient Asia Minor.....	80,000
In England	666,000

"Now, can any good reason be assigned why the richest nation in the world should be so ill provided in this respect? Why should we stand thus in contrast with other churches? Will it be said that our bishops are sufficient for our population, and that other nations have had too many? Then let us consider what are the duties of Bishops. Surely a Bishop ought to have the opportunity of making himself acquainted with every clergyman and every parish in his diocese, and not be known to his flock only in a hasty triennial visitation. It might be well, therefore, to compute how many times in their lives the Bishops in some of our larger dioceses could by possibility visit and preach in each parish of their dioceses. It might also reasonably be considered, whether the prevalence of schism, and the ignorance of the true character of the Church, and apathy as to its interest, may not be in a great measure traced to the want of personal intercourse between the people and their Bishops, in consequence of the overwhelming extent of their dioceses; and perhaps it might be found, on investigation, *that no more effectual step could be taken in Church restoration, than to assign to each Bishop a diocese of manageable size, so that he might reasonably hope, with God's blessing on his labour, to 'set in order' all that was wanting in it.*"—(pp. 17—20.)

"The notion of no more Bishops being appointed, because they could not have seats in the House of Lords, seems now to be very little regarded; or if it be thought an inconvenience, it seems to be acknowledged that the inconvenience should not be for a moment set in comparison with the urging necessity of the Church. Besides, the new Bishops might be of inferior rank to the old. Why should not a general move take place?—the two Metropolitans be made Patriarchs; the present Bishops, Metropolitans; the present Deans and Archdeacons be consecrated as Bishops; the Rural Deans take the place of Archdeacons; and others of the inferior clergy appointed to fill the vacancies made by the Rural Deans? All this may appear very presumptuous in me to allude to; but I only throw it out, as being a legitimate part of the enquiry to be made, if sanctioned by their lordships, with a view to the thorough restoration of the Church to its proper efficiency. If the facts elicited prove a large increase of our number of Bishops to be necessary,

what should hinder a great nation like ours from making it? It is mere prejudice to think that our Church should be always of its present extent. We boast that we live in days of reform, and do not scruple to make such alterations as are proved to be necessary. While every thing else is advancing around us, why should the Church alone stand still? In doctrine and in discipline it will indeed remain the same till the end of time; but in extent it should surely be adapted to the existing exigencies of the nation.—(pp. 21—22.)

We are quite prepared to agree with Mr. Gresley in these remarks upon the disease which affects the very vitals of the Church. We have learned from the experience of a century and a half that missionary Bishops are indispensable to the proper representation of Christianity abroad; and that the principle of consolidation, which was originally applied with such success to churches established in heathen cities, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Rome, &c., requires to be adapted in reference not only to our own distant colonies, but to heathen countries which by pact, or by purchase, or by conquest, may come beneath the British sceptre. Had the venerable society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts acted from the first upon the principle of never opening a mission, without placing a bishop at its head, it is more than probable that the stations which it occupies, though perhaps fewer in number, would have been much more abundantly provided with native clergy, than they can now possibly be with missionaries dispatched from home; while, instead of a precarious and fluctuating existence in the midst of populations only half-civilized and too often less than half-christianized, the church would have been represented in every town or village by her authorized ministers, and established, if not by the authority of the government, at least in the hearts of the people. Assuredly, if we may judge by the results which have attended the appointment of colonial Bishops, both as regards the multiplication of churches, and the increase of clergymen (of which the diocese of Barbadoes is an illustrious example) it would seem that the Church is most efficient in its operations, when exhibited in its perfection—that is, when the principle of its government is an episcopacy *which may be felt*. Now here is the deficiency of our church polity at home—here is the great deviation, at least of the Anglican Church, from primitive or rather apostolic precedent—the really primitive Church was episcopacy concentrated—the Anglican Church is episcopacy diffused, or rather diluted. “Thy silver is become dross; thy wine mixed with water.” “It would be well to compute,” says Mr. Gresley, “how many times in their lives the Bishops in some of our larger dioceses could by possibility visit and preach in each parish of their dioceses.” On the obvious principle, therefore, that one fact is worth a thousand arguments, we will just enter into the compu-

tation, that we may afterwards re-state Mr. Gresley's correct conclusion with greater emphasis.

The diocese of Lincoln contains 1072 benefices. If the Bishop were to visit and preach in each parish of his diocese at the average of *four* every week, which it need hardly be said is far too high an average, considering "that which cometh upon him daily, the care of all the churches," *five* years would be required for a circuit of the diocese of Lincoln—and if the weekly average be set at *two* (which with the necessary deduction for parliamentary and other duties is fully adequate to the powers, both physical and mental, of ordinary men, and even Bishops) the visitation of this diocese would occupy *ten* years. On the same principle the visitation of the diocese of Norwich, containing 920 benefices, would occupy *eight* years; of Exeter, York, and Chester, *six*—while the Prelate of Rochester alone amidst the English hierarchy could pay an episcopal visit to every church and parish in his diocese, for the purpose of setting in order the things that are wanting, within the compass of a single year. We think, then, that it *is*, as Mr. Gresley suggests that it *might* be, "found on investigation, that no more effectual step could be taken in Church restoration than to assign to each Bishop a diocese of manageable size, so that he might reasonably hope, with God's blessing on his labour, to set in order all that is waiting on it."

Unhappily the course of the *civil* rulers of the Church, in later years, has been in direct retrogression from Mr. Gresley's scheme of restoration. Not having sufficient employment, according to modern legislative notions of episcopal duty, in his 85 benefices, the Bishop of Cork and Ross is further charged with the 89 parishes or unions of Cloyne; and on the same principle the 54 benefices of Cashel and Emly are added to the 51 of Waterford and Lismore. And if it be said that the proportion of Protestants in Ireland is numerically small, and that on this account one hundred Irish benefices require less episcopal superintendence than half the number in the sister country, we should reply (though not admitting for an instant the validity of the plea, as the Romanists even in Ireland do not more than equipoise in numbers the Pagans of the primitive times) that a mistake yet more flagrant, and we believe under the present circumstances of the Church more injurious, has been made in the union of the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol—each of itself sufficient, and more than sufficient to constitute a diocese of "manageable size;" at least if Mr. Gresley's definition of the phrase be accepted—"one in which the Bishop may reasonably hope, with God's blessing on his labours, to set in order all that is wanting." Gloucester and Bristol are, we believe, quite as far asunder as Thyatira and Sardis, or Laodicea and Colosse; and if

by "restoration of the Church," Mr. Gresley means us to understand conformity to the primitive pattern, allowing only for such modifications and adaptations as are necessitated by the altered state of society, we cannot but regret that this mischievous change was permitted by the guardians of the Church, and that they thus appeared to sanction that most pernicious principle in ecclesiastical legislation which modern statesmen have thought proper to assume—that the creation of a new bishopric is only to be accomplished by the extinction of an old one. If it be thus, we have already paid too dearly for Ripon, and shall pay more dearly still for Manchester. It might have been well for the Church, if the excellent prelate, who presides over the THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY benefices of the new diocese of Ripon, had been allowed to manifest what such talents, directed by such piety, might have accomplished for the smaller and therefore more primitive see of Bristol, with or without the appendage of the Archdeaconry of Dorset. The truth is, that if episcopacy were to be felt in its efficiency throughout the Church, no one diocese ought to reckon more at the utmost than 100 parishes; and consequently the average being somewhere between 450 and 500* (exclusive of the really primitive diocese of Sodor and Man), the existing number of bishops ought to be increased five-fold. How this may be accomplished, or rather how a step may be taken toward its accomplishment, without any sudden and violent change in the present organization of the church, we shall proceed to shew; and though we have agreed with Mr. Gresley as to the symptoms and effects of the disease, we must be permitted to differ from him as to the application of the remedy.

Mr. Gresley asks, in language almost too flippant for the grave importance of the subject, at least for the dignified persons to whom it is addressed, "Why should not a general move take place—the two Metropolitans be made Patriarchs, and the present Bishops, Metropolitans; the present Deans and Archdeacons be consecrated as Bishops, the rural Deans take the place of Archdeacons; and others of the inferior clergy be appointed to fill the vacancies made by the rural Deans?" We think we can assign a sufficient reason why this general move should not take place in the precise order which Mr. Gresley has pointed out; and if he thinks it necessary to apologize for "the presumption of having alluded to it," we have so far the advantage of him, that we stand in the position not of a self-elected counsellor offering advice to the Bishops, but of an obscure and nameless critic commenting upon the suggestion of a simple Prebendary. What, we would ask, was

* Mr. Palmer gives 412.

the date of the usurpation — for it can be designated nothing better—of this unscriptural name of PATRIARCH? Can it be traced beyond the age of Constantine, or can any other reason be assigned for its adoption by that Emperor than that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction might be commensurate with the civil, and the four Patriarchs of Rome, Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople, might correspond with the four Prætorian Prefects? Why, then, does Mr. Gresley propose the introduction of it into the Anglican church, where there is no cognate secular authority excepting that of the lords lieutenant of counties; so that if the same principle of association be admitted, we shall require not *two* Patriarchs, but *fifty-two*? The fact is, that from the date of the creation of these new dignities of Patriarch, Exarch, Metropolitan, Archbishop, we may trace a considerable decline in the spirituality and purity of the Church, which might almost justify the piquant saying so much admired by Mr. Froude, that the Church became united to the State as Israel was to Egypt. Men still desire for themselves what the mother of Zebedee solicited for her sons, the place of honour at the right hand and on the left—and when, as in the era of Constantine, there were 1800 Bishops and only four Patriarchs, it was only natural that the attainment of this superior ecclesiastical dignity should occasion the practice of every species of intrigue, and that the elevation should come to depend, not upon the merits or piety of the individual, but the caprice or favour of the Prince. Most assuredly we want no Patriarch in the Anglican Church, which is already more conformed to the pattern existing previously to the public profession of Constantine, than the Hierarchy established by that Emperor, excepting in the number of Bishops. We are not disposed to take any exception to the title of Archbishop, which, if not absolutely scriptural, is yet an intelligent modification of a scriptural name, and describes accurately the functions exercised by the individual who bears it. But we do intreat Mr. Gresley to withdraw or modify his suggestions of an unwieldy ecclesiastical machinery, which would encumber rather than expedite the “restoration” for which he pleads. We want no Patriarchs. And cases of appeal from episcopal jurisdiction are not, we would hope, sufficiently numerous to require more than two Archbishops or Metropolitans, for we would now regard the titles as identical, though they were not so in the days of Constantine. We would leave the Archbishops and Bishops, then, in the position which they now occupy, and begin our “general move” one degree lower than does the Prebendary of Lichfield. The annexation of temporal Baronies to the existing Bishoprics, and the high commission which the Prelates bear of representing the national Church in the highest

legislative assembly, would always draw a sufficiently broad line of distinction between the Bishops of the old and of the new creation. And as the term Prelate is civil, not ecclesiastical, we would designate the one class Bishops and Prelates, the other, Bishops only; we would have the one addressed as at present, Lord Bishops; the other, as in the Scottish and American churches, Right Reverend Sir. We would here gladly appropriate so much of Mr. Gresley's proposal as relates to the consecration, as suffragan or coadjutor Bishops, of the respective Deans and Archdeacons, providing for the decent maintenance of the latter by the annexation to each suffragan see of a stall in the Diocesan Cathedral. We would not interfere, in the slightest degree, with the existing Episcopal jurisdiction in matters strictly of a civil character, which would properly be left to the Prelate who combined the political with the ecclesiastical functions of the office. And if it be lawful, in such a question, *parvis componere magna*, we would say that we do not foresee any practical difficulty in such a separation, which would be more formidable than those which have presented themselves in the ecclesiastical division of parishes. Into the detail of such a change, however, it would be premature to enter, for no slight step will have been taken in advance, if Mr. Gresley's pamphlet and pleadings can win candid consideration for the change itself. Let it then simply be urged, at present, that for such a stride towards "Church restoration" we have the precedent of the early primitive Church—the Church, before her pure gold was debased by the intermixture of miry clay, by her association with the state, and correspondent initiation into all the trickery, and chicanery of political speculators. If, at the period of the Council of Nice, one thousand Bishops administered the Eastern, and eight hundred the Western Empire, the adoption of a similar proportion would give to the Anglican Church at least the number already stated—120, or one to every hundred parishes;—and, singularly enough, by a happy coincidence, the consecration of the Deans and Archdeacons (at least if none of the former were already Bishops) would give nearly this number, (26×60) being $86 + 26 = 112$. If this could be accomplished by way of commencement, we should easily be able to calculate on the realization, at no distant period, (nay, perhaps within the space of ten years, which Mr. Gresley has suggested as the earliest possible period of this restitution of primitive purity) of all the remaining features of his plan, on which we have not space to comment at any length, but which would embody much that we have ventured, on former occasions, to point out as needful to the effective improvement of our ecclesiastical polity; for example—

1. The increase of the number of priests, or parochial ministers.
2. The revival of the primitive order of Deacons, at the proportion of, at least, one for every thousand souls.
3. The provision of suitable residences for the Clergy.
4. The perpetuation of parochial superintendence, by means of endowments.
5. The increase of buildings, suitable buildings, for public worship.

We do not pledge ourselves in detail to every particular statement of Mr. Gresley's views on these important subjects. For example, we do not quite understand what he means by requiring not only that the churches should be so constructed as to last beyond the present generation, but "should be so arranged that the services of our Liturgy may be properly performed in them." Possibly our notions of a *proper* performance of the Liturgy might not exactly correspond; as we are not quite reconciled to the Minister being made inaudible by half the congregation, while he is leading their devotions. Nor do we think that the depositing of wax lights within the rails of that which is commonly called the "altar" is likely to enhance in any manner the devotional feeling of the worshipper. We prefer the old reading-desk to the modern eagle—or, as Mr. G. might term it, the original eagle risen like a phoenix from its ashes—and even with regard to the location of the font, we would rather remove it to a distance from the porch than hazard the health either of the mothers or the infants who attend the Sacrament of Baptism. *Sed hactenus hæc.* We have, while we are writing, received Mr. Palmer's Enquiry into the Possibility of Obtaining Means for Church Extension, and we feel compelled by it to revert for a few moments to the subject of additional Bishoprics. We perceive that some of Mr. Palmer's calculations exactly coincide with our own, and it would, therefore, be a very indifferent compliment to our own judgment did we not consider them eminently deserving of attention.

"Looking to the invariable rule of the ancient Church, to place a Bishop in every great city, for the purpose of giving energy, unity, and consistency to the large body of clergy collected there, it seems strange indeed to think that places like Liverpool, Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester, Nottingham, Sheffield, Derby, Newcastle, Bath, Plymouth, and many other towns of great population and importance, should have been so long left without resident Bishops. Romanism has, with its usual quicksightedness, availed itself of our deficiencies, and fixed the residence of its pretended Bishops in large cities, where none of our Bishops are stationed. Birmingham, Bath, Wolverhampton, Liverpool, and other important stations, are thus circumstanced; and in some of these places Romish ecclesiastics are gradually assuming a position, which can only arise from the want of Bishops in those localities.

"It is not for me to say what number of episcopal sees would be sufficient for England and Wales. There can be no impropriety, however, in mention-

ing some principles which may lead to a solution of the question. A diocese ought to be of such dimensions, that a Bishop might, without much difficulty, visit *personally*, every year, or at least every second year, all the parishes subject to his jurisdiction, with a view to examine *on the spot* all the particulars which concern the spiritual well-being of the people; to preach the gospel; and to administer confirmation without those large assemblages which are productive of many inconveniences. The vast size of our dioceses has long rendered this efficient system of superintendence wholly impossible, and in consequence discipline has become relaxed, and the unity of the Church has been impaired. Enquiries instituted at a distance, and in writing, can never have that cogency which would attend on personal inspection. All bodies which are exempt from a complete and searching local inspection, are liable to fall into disorders."—(pp. 28—30.)

"On the other hand, suppose so large a number of new sees founded by the division of the present dioceses, that one or more might be placed under the jurisdiction of every existing see—the latter by this arrangement becoming metropolitan or archiepiscopal, and exercising over its suffragans the same jurisdiction which the see of Canterbury exercises over the dioceses subject to it; in this case the total impossibility of introducing so large a body of prelates into the House of Lords, and the distinction in ecclesiastical rank, would furnish obvious reasons for not investing the new prelates with the peerage, except beyond the walls of parliament. The Church would be sufficiently represented by her twenty-four metropolitans, and her two Archbishops, who, in virtue of the rank given to their suffragan sees (which would still remain subject to their authority) would *become* patriarchs, whether that title was assumed or not.

"The same distinction in ecclesiastical and temporal rank would point out the propriety of giving the new Bishops smaller incomes than the metropolitans, as their expenses would be less. Perhaps £2000 per annum on an average, with a see house, might be sufficient."—(pp. 31, 32.)

At one thing, however, we confess we *are* astonished. We certainly had not looked to writers of the school to which Mr. Palmer is supposed to belong for any advocacy of that which, on Church principles, is decidedly the most objectionable feature, and the most diametrically opposed to primitive practice, in our ecclesiastical system. "The constitution of the primitive Church," says Dean Waddington, (no bigoted or illiberal historian) "was free and independent—the Bishops and Teachers were chosen by the clergy and people—in his (the Bishop's) election, the people had an equal share with the Presbyters and inferior clergy; and it is clear that their right in the matter was not merely testimonial, but judicial and elective." Yet Mr. Palmer thinks that "the Crown would reasonably claim the appointment to all the new sees, having supplied their endowments." *We* think that their endowments would be too dearly purchased at such a rate. We could not object to the influence of political considerations in the case of those who are to exercise political functions: nor, were the right of electing bishops, by an act of tardy justice, restored to the chapters from which it ought never to have been wrested, do we think that there would be any thing repugnant to the first principles of church government, in the concession of a veto to the Crown—or at least to the govern-

ment which represents it for the time. But considering what men are, what they have ever been, and what they will in all likelihood continue still to be, we do hold that the extension of the power of creating Bishops *ad libitum*, vested in the Minister of the day, would be the most effectual engine that could be devised for the debasement, the corruption, and the enslaving of the church. It would be a virtual disfranchisement of the present ecclesiastical corporation—a complete subversion of the principle of free choice, and we would hesitate long and meditate deeply before we would promote the sixty Archdeacons appointed by the Bishops into sixty suffragan Bishops to be appointed by the Crown.

Other suggestions have been made by Mr. Palmer, into which we have not space to enter minutely, but to some of which we may probably, in a future article, refer. We think that enough will have been accomplished, for the present, if the public mind is drawn to contemplate the subject of the increase of Bishops, in connection with the multiplication of new churches, and the proportionate augmentation of the parochial clergy. To both these, we think, it is the most appropriate, and likely to be the most effectual introduction: and we are sure it might be accomplished with far less difficulty than either. What is sufficient for a Dean or an Archdeacon would not starve a Bishop, at least a Bishop conformed to the truly primitive model, and willing to spend and be spent in the cause of his divine Master. We are not aware that the American Church has experienced the least difficulty in finding “sufficiency of Bishops”—we are sure that she has called to the episcopal dignity and function not a few who would do credit to any church in Christendom, and yet we much doubt whether the whole revenues of her episcopal College are equal to those of three English Deaneries—St. Paul’s, Westminster, and Lincoln. Mr. Palmer tells us, (p. 38.) that “each of his proposed Dioceses would contain, on an average, 170 clergy, and 200,000 people.” If any man, in desiring the office of a Bishop, desireth a good work, is he more than sufficient for these things?

Towards the close of his pamphlet, Mr. Palmer touches the question of Ecclesiastical Seminaries, which was fully discussed in our last number. We place his views before our readers, and are well pleased to find how far they coincide with our own. We still think that two Provincial (or as Mr. Palmer would have it, Patriarchial Theological Institutions or Colleges) are to be greatly preferred to *eight* or *ten* Diocesan Seminaries; and that instead of remaining seven or eight years before ordination, the students might spend three years in preparatory studies, and five in the duties of the Diaconate. We, like Mr. Palmer, are “mainly desir-

ous to urge on the friends of the church the necessity for adopting some measure," persuaded, with him, that "if nothing be done, we shall probably before long find extreme difficulty with reference to the supply of clergy." But there is a remedy for this. Let the Church increase her Bishops, and precisely in the same proportion will she increase her parochial clergy, and multiply through the length and breadth of the land, a dutiful, attached, and devoted people—a generation "who will rise up and call her blessed."

"The necessity of ecclesiastical seminaries, or of some mode of providing for the education of additional clergy, is closely connected with the question of Church extension. At present, I believe, about 450 deacons are ordained every year. How are we to raise the number to 600 or 700? The salaries offered under any plan of Church extension can afford no encouragement to the wealthier classes to devote their children to the ministry; nor does it seem that the universities can much enlarge the number of their students, or reduce the scale of expense so low, as to bring university education generally within the reach of persons of small fortune.

"Were it possible to devise some additional system of education for holy orders at *half* the expense now incurred in the universities, (that is, at £60 or £80 per annum,) many parents would gladly avail themselves of the opportunity; and thus, while the universities would still continue to educate the mass of the clergy, and all the wealthier classes, ecclesiastical seminaries might enlist in the service of religion, talents and energies which must otherwise have been devoted to secular pursuits; and might have the INCALCULABLY IMPORTANT effect of connecting the *middling* classes of society more closely with the established Church.

"It has been frequently urged of late, that the cathedral clergy are the most appropriate superintendents of clerical and religious education. This generally-admitted principle points at once to the provision for ecclesiastical seminaries. Eight or ten institutions of this kind might easily be attached to as many cathedrals, and placed under the direction of their Deans and Canons. Education might here be imparted *free of expense*, while the houses of the suppressed canonries would afford lodgings for numerous students; and the mode of living might easily be regulated so as to ensure economy. The students might remain in these seminaries for seven or eight years before their admission to holy orders, and receive a thoroughly good professional education. With a view to secure uniformity of instruction, it might perhaps be provided that no class-books should be employed, except those permitted by the heads of the Church, and no professors appointed without the same sanction; and an effective power of control and visitation should be lodged in the proper hands.

The revival of two or three canonries with small incomes in each of the cathedrals, under the powers reserved by the Church Temporalities Act, would probably be found to furnish ample inducement to fellows of colleges in the universities, or others, to give their services for the education of youth in the theological seminaries, especially if it should seem likely to lead to the exercise of episcopal patronage in their favour.

"Objections, perhaps insurmountable, may be entertained to this particular plan of providing for an increased supply of clergy. I am only anxious to urge on the friends of the Church the necessity for adopting *some* measure. If nothing be done, we shall probably, before long, find extreme difficulties with reference to the supply of clergy."—(pp. 38—40.)

We propose to touch, in our next number, on the important subject which Mr. Palmer announces in his title, though he does

not sufficiently discuss it in his pamphlet—"the possibility of obtaining means for church extension, without Parliamentary grants." At present, we will only remark, that to the means which he has stated, we have three grave objections ; first, we believe them to be impracticable ; secondly, we think them inexpedient ; and, thirdly, we know them to be unjust.

BIBLICAL RESEARCHES IN PALESTINE, MOUNT SINAI, AND ARABIA PETRÆA : *a Journal of Travels in the Year 1838, by E. Robinson and E. Smith, undertaken in reference to Biblical Geography,* Drawn up from the original Diaries, with Historical Illustrations, by EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D. Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York ; Author of a Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, &c. In Three Vols. London : Murray. 1841.

THE ancient people of God have begun to resume their due place in the thought and care of the Gentile Churches. Every thing connected with their past history, their present state, or future prospects, has become the object of close research. Books are continually issuing from the press, which show how strongly the attention of Christians is now turned towards the sons of Israel ; histories of the Jews, enquiries for the lost tribes, accounts of Jewish usages, and Rabbinical commentaries and illustrations, travels and researches connected with the land of Palestine. We hail these tokens of approaching mercy to the outcasts of Zion. No surer or simpler sign can be exhibited to the faith of the Church, than one which finds its echo and response in the breasts of her own children ; and when they learn to pity the stones and take pleasure in the dust of Zion, they may assuredly gather that the time of mercy and redemption is nearly come.

The present volumes, in this light, have a peculiar interest. They show us a Christian from the extreme bounds of *Christian* civilization, turning his steps to the birth-place of our holy religion, to trace out the memorials which it yields of the wonderful works of God. They shew how from the bosom of a polity the most democratic in its form, and recent in its birth, yearnings naturally arise towards the scene of the ancient theocracy, and of the noble works which our fathers have declared to us even from the time of

old. So that, besides their direct interest, the researches of our Author seem a cheering anticipation of that promised time when "Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord, and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem."

The present work is the result of a journey undertaken by Dr. Robinson, with the express view of investigating the geography of Palestine and the Wilderness, and in which he was accompanied and assisted by Mr. Smith, an American Missionary, whose experience of Eastern habits, and knowledge of the language, were of the utmost service. It is compiled in the form of a journal, but copious historical illustrations are interwoven with every part; and the maps, drawn up chiefly from original observation by a Berlin geographer, add greatly to the value of the work. We shall best consult the advantage of our readers by selecting as many extracts as our narrow limits will allow.

The Author's route to Palestine was through Germany, by Trieste, the Adriatic, Greece and Smyrna. The circumstances of his approach to Athens will awaken interesting themes of reflection both in the scholar and the Christian, from the strange contrast of associations :—

"In the morning of December 8th, we were abreast of Hydra, at some distance from it; and could see on our right the little island of St. George, and the remoter ones of Zea and Thermia. Cape Colonna was also visible, and the island Helena beyond; while before us lay Mount Hymettus, upon which a cloud was discharging its snows. As we advanced, the Acropolis, and then Mount Pentelicus, opened upon the view; and rounding the promontory of Mynichia, we cast anchor at half-past eleven o'clock in the oval land-locked basin of the Piræus. We were somewhat astonished to find fiacres in waiting, apparently of German manufacture; and in one of them we were soon on our way along a macadamized road to the city of Athens, a distance of six English miles.

"The drive was accompanied by sad feelings. The day was cloudy, cold, and cheerless. The plain and mountains around, the scenes of so many thrilling associations, were untilled and desolate; and on every side were seen the noblest monuments of antiquity in ruins, now serving to mark only the downfall of human greatness and of human pride. Nor did the entrance to the city tend to dissipate these feelings. Small dwellings of stone, huddled together along narrow, crooked, unpaved, filthy lanes, are not the Athens which the scholar loves in imagination to contemplate. Yet they constitute, with a few exceptions, the whole of modern Athens. Even in its best parts, and in the vicinity of the court itself, there is often an air of haste and shabbiness, which, although not a matter of wonder, under the circumstances in which the city has been built up, cannot fail to excite in the stranger a feeling of disappointment and sadness. This, however, does not last long. The force of historical associations is too powerful not to triumph over present degradation, and the traveller soon forgets the scenes before him, and dwells only on the remembrance of the past."—(pp. 8, 9.)

But we must pass rapidly over the earlier stages of the journey, though every footstep of a traveller in the East seems to wake an

echo of departed greatness. The account of the present state of ancient Goshen will interest the Biblical student :—

“The Land of Goshen was ‘the best of the land;’ and such too the province esh-Shurkiyeh has ever been, down to the present time. In the remarkable Arabic document translated by De Sacy, containing a valuation of all the provinces and villages of Egypt in the year 1376, the province of the Shurkiyeh comprises 383 towns and villages, and is valued at 1,411,875 *Dinars*—a larger sum than is put upon any other province, with one exception. During my stay in Cairo, I made many enquiries respecting this district; to which the uniform reply was, that it was considered as the best province in Egypt. Wishing to obtain more definite information, I ventured to request of Lord Prudhoe, with whom the Pasha was understood to be on a very friendly footing, to obtain for me, if possible, a statement of the valuation of the provinces of Egypt. This, as he afterwards informed me, could not well be done; but he had ascertained that the province of the Shurkiyeh bears the highest valuation and yields the largest revenue. He had himself just returned from an excursion to the lower parts of this province, and confirmed from his own observation the reports of its fertility. This arises from the fact that it is intersected by canals, while the surface of the land is less elevated above the level of the Nile, than in other parts of Egypt; so that it is more easily irrigated. There are here more flocks and herds than anywhere else in Egypt; and also more fishermen. The population is half migratory, composed partly of Fellâhs, and partly of Arabs from the adjacent deserts and even from Syria; who retain in part their nomadic habits, and frequently remove from one village to another. Yet there are very many villages wholly deserted, where many thousands of people might at once find a habitation. Even now another million at least might be sustained in the district; and the soil is capable of higher tillage to an indefinite extent. So too the adjacent desert, so far as water could be applied for irrigation, might be rendered fertile; for wherever water is, there is fertility.”—(pp. 78, 79.)

With regard to the route of the passage over the Red Sea, which Dr. Robertson adopts, after many others, we feel very sceptical; and believe there exists considerable traditional warrant, of the exact kind which he rates most highly, in the native Arabic names, for a more northern track. But we leave this point to be settled by those who are more intimate with the scene of the miracle than ourselves.

The following passage, in a writer of Dr. Robinson's stamp, caused us no little surprise. Surely our Author has not forgotten the very plain explanation which the inspired narrative supplies:—

“Water, such as it is, the Israelites would find in small quantities throughout this tract; and they probably continued to practise the method of sweetening it which they had been taught at Marah; for we hear no more complaint of bad water. But how they could have obtained a *sufficiency* of water during their whole stay in the peninsula and their subsequent wanderings in the desert, even where no want of water is mentioned, is a mystery which I am unable to solve; unless we admit the supposition, that water was anciently far more abundant in these regions than at present. As we saw the peninsula, a body of two millions of men could not subsist there a week, without drawing their supplies of water, as well as of provisions, from a great distance.”—(p. 160.)

Has Dr. Robinson forgotten the express statement—“they

drank of that spiritual rock that *followed* them?" implying surely that the stream from the smaller rock continued long to attend them. Nor is there a syllable in Scripture about a "method of sweetening" the water, any more than Elisha sought a general "method" of healing leprosy. The effect was clearly miraculous, though at the same time a most beautiful and expressive parable of the true cure of affliction. We regret to see in so valuable an author this tinge from the miserable school of German neology.

The account of the approach to Sinai is very interesting, and illustrates the sacred narrative in a striking manner:—

"As we advanced, the valley still opened wider and wider with a gentle ascent, and became full of shrubs and tufts of herbs, shut in on each side by lofty granite ridges, with rugged, shattered peaks a thousand feet high, while the face of Horeb rose directly before us. Both my companion and myself involuntarily exclaimed: 'Here is room enough for a large encampment!' Reaching the top of the ascent, or water-shed, a fine broad plain lay before us, sloping down gently towards the S.S.E. enclosed by rugged and venerable mountains of dark granite, stern, naked, splintered peaks and ridges, of indescribable grandeur; and terminated at the distance of more than a mile by the bold and awful front of Horeb, rising perpendicularly in frowning majesty, from twelve to fifteen hundred feet in height. It was a scene of solemn grandeur, wholly unexpected, and such as we had never seen; and the associations which at the moment rushed upon our minds were almost overwhelming. As we went on, new points of interest were continually opening to our view. On the left of Horeb, a deep and narrow valley runs up S.S.E. between lofty walls of rock, as if in continuation of the S.E. corner of the plain. In this valley, at the distance of near a mile from the plain, stands the convent: and the deep verdure of its fruit-trees and cypresses is seen as the traveller approaches,—an oasis of beauty amid scenes of the sternest desolation. At the S.W. corner of the plain the cliffs also retreat, and form a recess or open place extending from the plain westward for some distance. From this recess there runs up a similar narrow valley on the west of Horeb, called el-Leja, parallel to that in which the convent stands; and in it is the deserted convent el-Arba'in, with a garden of olive and other fruit-trees not visible from the plain. A third garden lies at the mouth of el-Leja, and a fourth further west in the recess just mentioned. The whole plain is called Wady er-Râhah; and the valley of the convent is known to the Arabs as Wady Shu'eib, that is, the Vale of Jethro. Still advancing, the front of Horeb rose like a wall before us; and one can approach quite to the foot and touch the mount. Directly before its base is the deep bed of a torrent, by which in the rainy season the waters of el-Leja and the mountains around the recess pass down eastward across the plain, forming the commencement of Wady esh-Sheikh, which then issues by an opening through the cliffs of the eastern mountain,—a fine broad valley affording the only easy access to the plain and convent.—As we crossed the plain our feelings were strongly affected, at finding here so unexpectedly a spot so entirely adapted to the Scriptural account of the giving of the law. No traveller has described this plain, nor even mentioned it except in a slight and general manner; probably because the most have reached the convent by another route without passing over it; and perhaps, too, because neither the highest point of Sinai (now called Jebel Mûsa), nor the still loftier summit of St. Catherine, is visible from any part of it."—(pp. 130—132.)

"The extreme difficulty and even danger of the ascent, was well rewarded by the prospect that now opened before us. The whole plain er-Râhah lay spread out beneath our feet, with the adjacent Wadys and mountains; while

Wady esh-Sheikh on the right, and the recess on the left, both connected with, and opening broadly from er-Râhah, presented an area which serves nearly to double that of the plain. Our conviction was strengthened, that here or on some one of the adjacent cliffs was the spot, where the Lord 'descended in fire,' and proclaimed the law. Here lay the plain where the whole congregation might be assembled; here was the mount that could be approached and touched, if not forbidden; and here the mountain brow, where alone the lightnings and the thick cloud would be visible, and the thunders and the voice of the trumpet be heard, when the Lord 'came down in the sight of all the people upon Mount Sinai.' We gave ourselves up to the impressions of the awful scene; and read with a feeling that will never be forgotten, the sublime account of the transaction and the commandments there promulgated, in the original words as recorded by the great Hebrew legislator."—(pp. 157, 158.)

"We came to Sinai with some incredulity, wishing to investigate the point, whether there was any probable ground beyond monkish tradition, for fixing upon the present supposed site. The details of the preceding pages will have made the reader acquainted with the grounds which led us to the conviction, that the plain er-Râhah above described is the probable spot where the congregation of Israel were assembled, and that the mountain impending over it, the present Horeb, was the scene of the awful phenomena in which the law was given. We were satisfied, after much examination and inquiry, that in no other quarter of the peninsula, and certainly not around any of the higher peaks, is there a spot corresponding in any degree so fully as this to the historical account, and to the circumstances of the case. I have entered above more fully into the details, because former travellers have touched upon this point so slightly; and because, even to the present day, it is a current opinion among scholars, that no open space exists among these mountains. We, too, were surprised as well as gratified to find here, in the inmost recesses of these dark granite cliffs, this fine plain spread out before the mountain; and I know not when I have felt a thrill of stronger emotion, than when in first crossing the plain, the dark precipices of Horeb rising in solemn grandeur before us, we became aware of the entire adaptedness of the scene to the purposes for which it was chosen by the great Hebrew legislator. Moses, doubtless, during the forty years in which he kept the flocks of Jethro, had often wandered over these mountains, and was well acquainted with their vallies and deep recesses, like the Arabs of the present day. At any rate, he knew and had visited the spot to which he was to conduct his people,—this *adytum* in the midst of the great circular granite region, with only a single feasible entrance; a secret holy place, shut out from the world amid lone and desolate mountains."—(pp. 175, 176.)

From this holy ground, the scene of the first covenant, we turn to the places hallowed by the steps of the Incarnate Saviour, and where the New Covenant was sealed with his blood. And first Beersheba comes upon us like an apparition, with its ancient name:—

"We now felt that the desert was at an end. Descending gradually, we came out, at two o'clock, upon an open undulating country; the shrubs ceased, or nearly so; green grass was seen along the lesser water-courses, and almost green sward; while the gentle hills, covered in ordinary seasons with grass and rich pasture, were now burnt over with drought. Arabs were pasturing their camels in various parts, but no trace of dwellings was any where visible. At a quarter to three o'clock we reached Wady es-Seba', a wide watercourse, or bed of a torrent, running here W.S.W. towards Wady es-Suny. Upon its northern side, close upon the bank, are two deep wells,

still called Bir es-Seba', the ancient Beersheba. We had entered the borders of Palestine!"—(p. 300.)

"Here then is the place where the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, often dwelt! Here Abraham dug perhaps this very well: and journeyed from hence with Isaac to Mount Moriah, to offer him up there in sacrifice. From this place Jacob fled to Padan-Aram, after acquiring the birth-right and blessing belonging to his brother: and here too he sacrificed to the Lord on setting off to meet his son Joseph in Egypt. Here Samuel made his sons judges; and from here Elijah wandered out into the southern desert, and sat down under a shrub of Retem, just as our Arabs sat down under it every day and every night. Here was the border of Palestine proper, which extended from Dan to Beersheba. Over these swelling hills the flocks of the patriarchs once roved by thousands; where now we found only a few camels, asses, and goats!

Beersheba is last mentioned in the Old Testament, as one of the places to which the Jews returned after the exile. The name does not occur in the New Testament; nor is it referred to as then existing by any writer earlier than Eusebius and Jerome in the fourth century. They describe it as a large village with a Roman garrison. It is found as an episcopal city in the early ecclesiastical and other *Notitiæ* referring to the centuries before and after the Mahomedan conquests; but none of its bishops are any where mentioned. Its site was in like manner long forgotten; and the crusaders assigned this name to the place now called Beit Jibrin, lying between Hebron and Askelon. About the middle of the fourteen century, Sir John Maundeville, and also Rudolf de Suchem and William de Baldensel, passed on this route from Sinai to Hebron and Jerusalem; and all of them mention here Beersheba. The two latter say it was then uninhabited, but some of the churches were still standing. From this time onward for five centuries, it has again remained until this day apparently unvisited and unknown, except the slight notice which Seetzen obtained respecting it from the Arabs."—pp. 302, 303.)

How affecting, how intensely thrilling is the reflection that these scanty ruins continue with the ancient name, a pledge unnoticed and forgotten amidst the rise and fall of cities and empires, of the truth of God's oath and covenant, and the assured blessedness in times to come of all the nations of the earth.

The following investigation connected with the temple and mosk, and its results, possess no common interest, and will warrant us in making a longer extract:—

"At the first view of these walls, I was led to the persuasion, that the lower portions had belonged to the ancient temple; and every subsequent visit only served to strengthen this conviction. The size of the stones and the heterogeneous character of the walls, render it a matter beyond all doubt, that the former were never laid in their present places by the Muhammedans; and the peculiar form in which they are hewn does not properly belong, so far as I know, either to Saracenic or to Roman architecture. Indeed every thing seems to point to a Jewish origin, and a discovery which we made in the course of our examination reduces this hypothesis to an absolute certainty.

"I have already related, in the preceding section, that during our first visit to the S.W. corner of the area of the mosk, we observed several of the large stones jutting out from the western wall, which at first sight seemed to be the effect of a bursting of the wall from some mighty shock or earthquake. We paid little regard to this at the moment, our attention being engrossed by other objects; but on mentioning the fact not long after in a circle of our friends, we found that they also had noticed it, and the remark was inciden-

tally dropped, that the stones had the appearance of having once belonged to a large arch. At this remark a train of thought flashed upon my mind, which I hardly dared to follow out, until I had again repaired to the spot, in order to satisfy myself with my own eyes, as to the truth or falsehood of the suggestion. I found it even so! The courses of these immense stones, which seemed at first to have sprung out from their places in the wall in consequence of some enormous violence, occupy nevertheless their original position; their external surface is hewn to a regular curve; and being fitted one upon another, they form the commencement or foot of an immense arch, which once sprung out from this western wall in a direction towards Mount Zion, across the Valley of the Tyropœon. This arch could only have belonged to THE BRIDGE, which according to Josephus led from this part of the temple to the Xystus on Zion; and it proves incontestibly the antiquity of that portion of the wall from which it springs.

"The traces of this arch are too distinct and definite to be mistaken. Its southern side is thirty-nine English feet distant from the S.W. corner of the area, and the arch itself measures fifty-one feet along the wall. *Three* courses of its stones still remain; of which one is five feet four inches thick, and the others not much less. One of the stones is twenty feet and a half long; another twenty-four feet and a half, and the rest in like proportion. The part of the curve or arc, which remains, is of course but a fragment; but of this fragment the chord measures twelve feet six inches; the sine eleven feet ten inches, and the cosine three feet ten inches.—The distance from this point across the valley to the precipitous natural rock of Zion we measured as exactly as the intervening field of prickly pear would permit, and found it to be three hundred and fifty feet, or about one hundred and sixteen yards. This gives the proximate length of the ancient bridge. We sought carefully along the brow of Zion for traces of its western termination, but without success. That quarter is now covered with mean houses and filth; and an examination can be carried on only in the midst of disgusting sights and smells.

"The existence of these remains of the ancient bridge seems to remove all doubt as to the identity of this part of the enclosure of the mosk with that of the ancient temple. How they can have remained for so many ages unseen or unnoticed by any writer or traveller, is a problem, which I would not undertake fully to solve. One cause has probably been the general oblivion, or want of knowledge, that any such bridge ever existed. It is mentioned by no writer but Josephus; and even by him only incidentally, though in five different places. The bridge was doubtless broken down in the general destruction of the city; and was in later ages forgotten by the Christian population, among whom the writings of Josephus were little known. For a like reason, we may suppose its remains to have escaped the notice of the crusaders and the pilgrims of the following centuries. Another cause which has operated in the case of later travellers, is probably the fact, that the spot is approached only through narrow and crooked lanes, in a part of the city whither their monastic guides did not care to accompany them; and which they themselves could not well, nor perhaps safely, explore alone. Or if any have penetrated to the place, and perhaps noticed these large stones springing from the wall, they have probably (as I did at first) regarded their appearance as accidental, and have passed on without further examination.

"Here then we have indisputable remains of Jewish antiquity, consisting of an important portion of the western wall of the ancient temple area. They are probably to be referred to a period long antecedent to the days of Herod: for the labours of this splendour-loving tyrant appear to have been confined to the body of the temple and the porticos around the court. The magnitude of the stones also, and the workmanship as compared with other remaining monuments of Herod, seem to point to an earlier origin. In the accounts we have of the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans, and its rebuilding by Zerubbabel under Darius, no mention is made of these exterior walls. The former temple was destroyed by fire, which would not affect these foundations.

nor is it probable that a feeble colony of returning exiles could have accomplished works like these. There seems therefore little room for hesitation in referring them back to the days of Solomon, or rather of his successors; who, according to Josephus, built up here immense walls, 'immoveable for all time.' Ages upon ages have since rolled away; yet these foundations still endure, and are immoveable as at the beginning. Nor is there aught in the present physical condition of these remains, to prevent them from continuing as long as the world shall last. It was the temple of the living God; and, like the everlasting hills on which it stood, its foundations were laid 'for all time.'

"Thus then we have here the western wall of the ancient temple area: on which is built up the same wall of the modern enclosure, though with far inferior materials and workmanship. The ancient southern wall is at the same time determined in like manner; for at the S.W. corner the lower stones towards the south have precisely the same character as those on the west; they are laid in alternate courses with the latter; and the whole corner is evidently one and the same original substruction. Proceeding to the S.E. corner, we find its character to be precisely similar; the same immense stones as already described, both towards the east and south, on the brink of the valley of Jehoshaphat; and the line of the southern wall at this point corresponding with that at the S.W. corner. We have, then, the two extremities of the ancient southern wall; which, as Josephus informs us, extended from the eastern to the western valley, and could not be prolonged further. Thus we are led irresistibly to the conclusion, that the area of the Jewish temple was identical on its western, eastern, and southern sides, with the present enclosure of the Haram."—(pp. 424—428.)

We have not space for several other passages of similar interest, connected with the localities of Jerusalem. Among other subjects, Dr. Robinson discusses at some length the site of the sepulchre, and comes to the conclusion, which seems well founded, that the present church lies within the second or old wall of the city, and cannot therefore be the true site. For arguments we can only refer to the work, vol. ii. pp. 69—80.

The discovery of Bethel, with its name only slightly changed, is curious and remarkable:—

"We now returned to the site of Beitín, and took a nearer survey of its ruins. They occupy the whole surface of the hill-point, sloping towards the S.E. and cover a space of three or four acres. They consist of very many foundations and half-standing walls of houses and other buildings. On the highest part, towards the N.N.W. are the remains of a square tower: and near the southern point the walls of a Greek church, standing within the foundations of a much larger and earlier edifice built of large stones, part of which have been used for erecting the later structure. The broken walls of several other churches are also to be distinguished. In the western valley are the remains of one of the largest reservoirs we saw in the country; measuring 314 feet in length from N.W. to S.E. and 217 feet in breadth from N.E. to S.W. The walls were built of massive stones; the southern one is still entire; those upon the sides are partly gone; while the northern one has almost wholly disappeared. The bottom was now a green grass-plat, having in it two living springs of good water. Here we spread our carpets on the grass for breakfast, by the side of these desolations of ages. A few Arabs, probably from some neighbouring village, had pitched their tents here for the summer, to watch their flocks and fields of grain; and they were the only inhabitants. From them we obtained milk and also

butter of excellent quality, which might have done honour to the days, when the flocks of Abraham and Jacob were pastured on these hills. It was indeed the finest we found anywhere in Palestine.

"There is little room for question, that both the name and site of Beitin are identical with those of the ancient Bethel. The latter was a border city between Benjamin and Ephraim: at first assigned to Benjamin, but conquered and afterwards retained by Ephraim. According to Eusebius and Jerome, it lay twelve Roman miles from Jerusalem, on the right or east of the road leading to Sichem or Neapolis (Nábulus). From Beitin to El-Bireh we found the distance to be forty-five minutes, and from Bireh to Jerusalem three hours, with horses. The correspondence therefore in the situation is very exact; and the name affords decisive confirmation. The Arabic termination *in* for the Hebrew *el*, is not an unusual change: we found indeed several other instances of it entirely parallel. Yet the name has been preserved solely among the common people. The monks appear for centuries not to have been aware of its existence: and have assigned to Bethel a location much further towards the north. Our friends the Greek priests at Taiyibeh had also recognized the identity of Beitin and Bethel; and had endeavoured to bring into use the Arabic form *Beitil* as being nearer to the original; but it had found currency only within the circle of their own influence. From them the missionaries in Jerusalem had heard of the place and had learned the name Beitil; though from others they had heard only of Beitin.

"Bethel is celebrated in the Old Testament. Abraham first pitched his tent in Palestine on the high ground eastward of this spot, still one of the finest tracts for pasturage in the whole land. Here Jacob slept on his way to Haran, and saw in his dream the ladder and the angels of God ascending and descending upon it; and hither he afterwards returned and built an altar, and called the place Beth-el, 'House of God.' Samuel came once a year to Bethel to judge the people. In later times it became notorious as a seat of idolatrous worship, after Jeroboam had erected here one of his golden calves. This was denounced at the time by a prophet of the Lord, who then transgressed and was destroyed by a lion. Bethel came afterwards into the possession of Judah; and king Josiah destroyed its altars and idols, burning upon them dead men's bones from the sepulchres. After the exile, the place was again inhabited by the returning Jews; and was fortified by Bacchides the Syrian in the time of the Maccabees.

"In the New Testament, Bethel is not mentioned; but it still existed, as we learn from Josephus; and was captured by Vespasian. Eusebius and Jerome describe it as a small village in their day. This is the last notice of Bethel as an inhabited place. The name is indeed mentioned by writers of the times of the crusades; but apparently only as a place known in Scripture history, and not as then in existence. Yet the present ruins are greater than those of a small village; and show that after the time of Jerome, the place must probably have revived and been enlarged. The ruined churches upon the site and beyond the valley, betoken a town of importance even down to the middle ages; and it certainly is matter of surprise, that no allusion to the place as then existing occurs in the historians of the crusades. The site would seem already to have been forgotten in ecclesiastical tradition. During the following centuries, Bethel was sought for near to Sichem; and it is only within the last three or four years that its name and site have been discovered among the common people, by the Protestant missionaries in Jerusalem. The monks even now know nothing of it; and the traveller who communicates only with them, is still led to believe that Bethel and its very name have perished."—(Vol. ii. pp. 126—130.)

We must reluctantly pass by the particulars relating to Gibeon, Michmash, Gibeah of Saul, Ramah and Anathoth, all of which were

visited; and their present Arabic names seem almost unchanged from those of scripture. The route of the Assyrian invader (Isa. x. 28—22) was distinctly traced on the face of the country. The following paragraphs have a double interest, from the places visited, and the insight which they give into the political state and prospects of the land:—

“From Ma'in we could distinguish quite a number of places. Of these places several are of unquestionable antiquity. Ma'in is without doubt the Maon of Nabal. Semû'a we had formerly seen from Dhoheriyeh, and it probably corresponds to the ancient Eshtemoa. 'Attir suggests the Jattir of Scripture; while Sûsieh is a tract of ruins in the middle of the plain, said to be large, with many columns, though there seemed to be no houses standing. 'Anâb is of course the ancient name Anab without change; and in Shuweikeh, the diminutive form of Shaukeh, we may recognise the Socoh of the mountains of Judah. In Yûtta and Kurmul we have the Juttah and Carmel of antiquity. Most of these places we afterwards saw again, in returning by a more western route from Wady Mûsa.

“Here then we found ourselves surrounded by the towns of the mountains of Judah, and could enumerate before us not less than nine places still bearing apparently their ancient names: 'Maon, Carmel, and Ziph, and Juttah; 'Jattir, Socoh, Anab, and Eshtemoa; 'and Kirjath Arba, which is Hebron.” The feelings with which we looked abroad upon these ancient sites, most of them which had hitherto remained unknown, were of themselves a sufficient reward for our whole journey.

“Of Ziph I have already spoken. Eusebius and Jerome enumerate Anab, Eshtemoa, Jattir, and Juttah, as large villages in their age; though the specifications they give of their sites are very indefinite. Maon was then desolate; and the Socoh of the mountains is not mentioned by them. Carmel existed, as we shall see immediately. But from the days of Jerome, until the present century, not one of these names, except Carmel, occurs in history, or has been known as being still in existence. The crusaders seem not to have penetrated into this region, except in one or two military excursions around the south end of the Dead Sea. In March, 1807, Seetzen passed through this tract in the same direction; and although his letter makes mention only of the mountain south of Carmel, yet his map contains the names of Kurmul, Semû'a, Yûtta and Shuweikeh. In 1818, Irby and Mangles and their companions travelled by this route from Hebron to the south end of the Dead Sea; but none of them mention any of these names. The former indeed describe what seems to have been Kurmul; but they call it 'Al-baid.' Within the last few years, travellers on the direct route from Wady Mûsa to Hebron have passed through Semû'a; but seem to have heard nothing of these other ancient places.

“While we were taking our observations, many of the peasants gathered around us, and seemed gratified to hold our telescopes and render other little services; although they wondered at our employment. The opinion was expressed among themselves, that we were each noting down his own estate in the lands around. Indeed, there seems to be a current impression, that ever since the country was in the hands of the Franks, their descendants still have deeds of all the land: and when travellers come here, their presumed object is to look up their estates. These poor people, however, seemed well-pleased at the idea of our coming to take possession; hoping in this way to be themselves freed from the oppression of Muslim misrule.”—(Vol. ii. pp. 194—196.)

A similar occurrence mentioned at a later date:—

“While we were taking the bearings, the men of the village flocked around us, and seemed much interested in our proceedings. This indeed

was the case in most of the villages. The people in general in this part of the country were ready to give us information, so far as they could; and seemed not to distrust us. Here too we found the same general impression, that our object was to collect information and survey the country, preparatory to the arrival of the Franks; and here too we were addressed in the usual phrase—'Do not be long.' Indeed the inhabitants every where appeared, for the most part, to desire that the Franks should send a force among them. They were formerly tired of the Turks; they were now still more heartily tired of the Egyptians; and were ready to welcome any Frank nation which should come, not to subdue (for that would not be necessary), but to take possession of the land."—(Vol. ii. p. 369.)

What an interesting train of thought must these facts awaken in every intelligent observer of Providence and student of prophecy! But we forbear to dwell on them, that we may find space for one passage more connected with Nabulus, the Roman Neapolis and ancient Shechem. We suspect that the account will be entirely new to most of our readers:—

"One of our first objects at Nabulus was to visit the Samaritans, that singular and feeble remnant of an ancient people, which to this day has survived the storms of ages and of adverse influences, upon their native soil. Some men formerly from Beirût soon came around us; and an old Christian of the Greek rite undertook to conduct us to the Samaritans, to the summit of Mount Gerizim, and to Jacob's well. We repaired to the city, passing among luxuriant groves of fig and other fruit trees, and entering by a gate at the western end. The quarter occupied by the Samaritans is in the S.W. part of the city, rising somewhat upon the acclivity of Gerizim. It is well built, and the houses seemed solid and comfortable. On coming to the synagogue, we found it closed. Several of the Samaritans came to us; but as the priest was not at hand to open the door, we could not now visit the synagogue. They offered us a guide, however, to the top of Mount Gerizim; and we determined to go thither immediately, and see the priest on our return. We set off therefore at four o'clock on foot, attended by one of the younger Samaritans, an honest simple-minded man. Our old Christian we were willing to dismiss till we came back; having discovered meantime, that his plan had been to take a Samaritan guide himself, besides demanding one of our mules to ride. We struck up the ravine above mentioned, which comes down from the S.W. and is full of fruit-trees and verdure. Just out of the city is a fine fountain, called 'Asal; and still further up, an aqueduct and mill.

"Above the ravine the ascent of the mountain is steep; yet not so but that one might ride up without difficulty. When about two thirds of the way up, we heard a woman calling after us, who proved to be the mother of our Samaritan guide. He was her only son, and had come away, it seems, without her knowledge; and she was now in the utmost terror at finding that he had gone off as a guide to Franks, to show them the holy mountain. She had immediately followed us, and was now crying after us with all the strength of her lungs, forbidding him to proceed, lest some evil should befall him. The young man went back to meet her, and tried to pacify her; but in vain; she insisted upon his returning home. This he was not inclined to do; although he said he could not disobey his mother, and so transgress the law of Moses. This touching trait gave us a favourable idea of the morality of the Samaritans. After reasoning with her a long time without effect, he finally persuaded her to go with us. So she followed us up; at first full of wrath, and keeping at a distance from us; yet at last she became quite reconciled and communicative.

"Twenty minutes of ascent from the city in the direction S.W. led us to

the top of Gerizim; which proved to be a tract of high table land stretching off far towards the W. and S.W. Twenty minutes more towards the S.E. along a regular path upon the table land, brought us to the Wely we had seen before, standing on a small eminence on the eastern brow of the mountain, perhaps the highest point; and overlooking the plain on the east, and indeed, all the country around, including Jebel esh-Sheikh or Hermon in the distance. Here is the holy place of the Samaritans, whither they still come up four times a year to worship. The spot where they sacrifice the passover, seven lambs among them all, was pointed out to us, just below the highest point and before coming to the last slight acclivity. It is marked by two parallel rows of rough stones laid upon the ground; and a small round pit, roughly stoned up, in which the flesh is roasted.

"On ascending the rise of ground beyond this spot, the first object which presents itself are the ruins of an immense structure of hewn stones, bearing every appearance of having once been a large and strong fortress. It consisted of two adjacent parts, each measuring about two hundred and fifty feet from E. to W. and two hundred feet from N. to S. giving a length in all of about four hundred feet in the latter direction. The stones are the common limestone of the region, tolerably large, and bevelled at the edges, though rough in the middle. The walls in some places are nine feet thick. At the four corners of the southern division were square towers, and one in the middle of the eastern side. In the northern part is now the Muslim Wely, and also a cemetery. The stranger at first is very naturally struck with the idea, that these must be the remains of the ancient temple of the Samaritans upon Mount Gerizim; but the Samaritans of the present day attach no sanctity whatever to these ruins, and simply call them el-Kul'ah, "the Castle." We shall hereafter see, that they are probably the remains of a fortress erected by Justinian.

"Just under the walls of the castle, on the west side, are a few flat stones, of which it is difficult to say whether they were laid there by nature or by man. Under these, the guide said, are the twelve stones brought out of Jordan by the Israelites; and there they will remain, until el-Muhdy (the guide) shall appear. This, he said, and not Messiah, is the name they give to the expected Saviour. He could not tell when he would appear; but there were already some tokens of his coming."—(Vol. iii. pp. 97—100.)

"The Samaritans are now reduced to a very small community; there being only thirty men who pay taxes, and few, if any, who are exempt; so that their whole number cannot be reckoned at over one hundred and fifty souls. One of them is in affluent circumstances; and having been for a long time chief secretary of the Mutesellim of Nâbulus, became one of the most important and powerful men of the province. He had recently been superseded in his influence with the governor by a Copt; and now held only the second place. He was called el-'Abd es-Sâmâry. The rest of the Samaritans are not remarkable either for their wealth or poverty. The physiognomy of those we saw was not Jewish; nor indeed did we remark in it any peculiar character, as distinguished from that of other natives of the country. They keep the Saturday as their Sabbath with great strictness, allowing no labour nor trading, not even cooking nor lighting a fire, but resting from their employments the whole day. On Friday evening they pray in their houses; and on Saturday have public prayers in their synagogue at morning, noon, and evening. They meet also in the synagogue on the great festivals, and on the new moons; but not every day. The law is read in public, not every Sabbath-day, but only upon the same festivals.

"Four times a year they go up to Mount Gerizim (Jebel et-Tûr) in solemn procession to worship; and they then begin reading the law as they set off, and finish it above. These seasons are: The feast of the passover, when they pitch their tents upon the mountain all night, and sacrifice seven lambs at sunset; the day of Pentecost: the feast of Tabernacles, when they sojourn here in booths built of branches of the arbutus; and lastly, the great day of

atonement in autumn. They still maintain their ancient hatred against the Jews; accuse them of departing from the law in not sacrificing the passover, and in various other points, as well as of corrupting the ancient text; and scrupulously avoid all connection with them. If of old "the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans," the latter at the present day reciprocate the feeling: and neither eat nor drink, nor marry, nor associate with the Jews; but only trade with them.

We inquired of the Samaritans respecting Jacob's well. They said they acknowledged the tradition, and regarded it as having belonged to the patriarch. It lies at the mouth of the valley, near the south side; and is the same which the Christians sometimes call Bîr es-Sâmîrîyeh, "Well of the Samaritan woman."—(Vol. iii. pp. 106, 107.)

The researches connected with Nazareth, and the neighbourhood of Tiberias, the fountains of the Jordan, and the southern part of the Dead Sea, are all of great interest: but our space forbids any further extracts. With a few blemishes, like the one already pointed out, and a want of that "*vivida vis animi*" which in a field of research so passing wonderful, is peculiarly to be desired, there is in these volumes a fulness of information, an accuracy of research, and a variety of fresh discovery, which render them a most valuable accession to the Biblical student. They will doubtless become a standard of reference to future travellers; and may serve for a still more important end, to deepen the faith, and enrich the spiritual emotions of every sincere Christian; and awaken a fresh interest in the Church towards the land of Israel, and the promised glories of the ancient people of God.

A PLEA FOR THE POOR. By the Hon. and Rev. B. W. NOEL.
(*Second Notice.*)

IN our last number we wavered, as our readers may probably have perceived, between our unwillingness to occupy any large proportion of our pages with a topic apparently of a political character, and our sense of the real importance of the discussion raised by Mr. Noel on the Corn Laws. Fearing that our brevity and compression might have injured the argument, it was far from disagreeable to us to find, in the following note, something like an invitation to re-consider our views.

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHURCHMAN'S REVIEW.

"SIR,—I owe you my best thanks for the kind spirit in which you have written your forcible answer to my tract.

"I believe your answer to be capable of complete refutation in

each of its main arguments, but I do not wish to enter into a lengthened controversy on any secular subject.

“ Permit me, however, to make one or two remarks.

“ First. I used the texts not to condemn any one ; but, first, to shew that Christians ought to take an interest in a question so vitally affecting the poor ; and, secondly, that the gospel requires Christian legislators peculiarly to regard their interests.

“ Secondly. I conceive your statement of the numbers dependent upon manufactures and upon agriculture to be erroneous, because both mining and mercantile classes depend far more on manufactures than on agriculture. Coals and iron are consumed in Lancashire more than in Kent ; and as we export no raw produce, our £20,000,000 customs depend mainly on manufactures.

“ Thirdly. The relative numbers of these two classes (agriculturists and manufacturers) very slightly affect the question, because those now employed will be very nearly in their present position ; but the question is, how we are to find employment for the new population from year to year. The 15,000,000 of acres of waste cannot meet our wants. How are wheat crops to ripen on the poor soils of Scotland ? Who is going to drain the Irish bogs ? And if the 8,500,000 acres of improveable English waste could profitably grow wheat, why has not wheat been already grown on them, since prices have been so high, and under extreme disadvantages the importation of foreign corn has for some years continued to increase ? If I mistake not, Mr. Alison’s statement (p. 525) contains *extraordinary* blunders, which if you read it with care you probably will perceive.

“ Fourthly. On the power of foreign manufactures to compete with ours, I *have* talked with our manufacturers, and know it to be their opinion, that if we have only a repeal of the Corn Laws, foreigners will not be able to compete with us *in the finer goods* for many years to come, if ever ;—their want of capital, mechanical skill, and industrious habits, being great temporary obstacles ; and their want of iron and coal, with their distance from the ports, being heavy permanent disadvantages.

“ On the whole, I see no ground to change one of the opinions expressed in my tract ; and since I believe, after reading all that can be said on the other side, that the repeal of our Corn Laws will feed millions who cannot otherwise be fed, you will not, I am sure, blame me for earnestly wishing that God may, in his mercy, grant us that great national blessing.

“ I am, Sir, with much respect, your obedient servant,
“ B. W. NOEL.”

“ Walthamstow, Sept. 9.”

The first reflection that crossed our minds, after reading this letter, was,—What a happiness will it be to the inhabitants of heaven, to find themselves living in *an atmosphere of truth*; so that, themselves desiring to know exactly what is *true* of all things, their desire will in no case be thwarted by false representations or distorting media. All will be truth, all *certainty*. But here, on a hundred different topics,—church and dissent; predestination and free-will; baptism or no baptism; voluntaryism or enforced contribution, to religion or the poor,—we have sincere Christians on all sides, really desiring to hold and enforce the truth, and yet, apparently, *unable to find it*! Take the present instance. If we know our own motives at all, we are quite free from any bias towards what is called “the landed interest.” We entirely and gladly admit, with Mr. Noel, that the question is, How the millions are to be fed? and it is on this ground exclusively that we wish the question to be argued. On the other hand we have not the slightest doubt that Mr. Noel’s mind is as sincerely bent on finding and maintaining the truth, as our own. The truth then being one; here are two parties bent on finding it; and yet, when each believes himself to have found it, two opposing and irreconcilable dogmas are produced! Thus, too, is it with numberless other questions. Probably it is useless to wonder and to grieve at this. To a certain degree, unquestionably, it may be considered an inevitable concomitant of our present spoiled and disorganised condition. It is the New Jerusalem only, of which it is said, “the city was of pure gold, like unto *clear glass*,” “*clear as crystal*,” and in which, as “there shall be no night there,” neither can there be any twilight, or imperfection of view, or of appreciation; or aught but what is simply and exactly “the truth.”

But ought we, then—inasmuch as mutual toleration is a clear duty—ought we to doubt the possibility of arriving at a *certainty* of the truth; or fall into the “liberal” notion that one view is as good as another? Far from it; our responsibility as to the use of our reasoning faculties is as great as in the employment of any other talent; and if, through prejudice, personal partialities, or neglect of proper investigation, we throw our influence into the wrong scale, and help forward falsehood instead of truth, we shall incur a guilt as great as if we wasted our property, misapplied our powers, or gave our time to trifles, when mighty realities had a claim upon it. We therefore turn, once more, with that kind of earnestness which begets a degree of hope, to the enquiry which Mr. Noel seems desirous to promote, and which he throws into apparently a very simple question;—namely,

“How are we to find employment for the new population from year to year?”

The first eighteen lines of Mr. Noel's letter present a variety of minor topics, on each of which we should be glad to say something. But we refrain from them all, in order to have more opportunity to do justice to this **GRAND QUESTION**, on which, it appears to us, Mr. Noel is still in fearful error. Fearful, we mean, in its results to others; fearful, as fraught with danger to the whole community.

The grand question is—and with reference to it Mr. Noel appears to be infected with the heresy of Malthus—whether the **ALL-WISE** and **ALL-MERCIFUL** ever casts upon any country of this earth a larger number of the human race than that particular spot can sustain, by its products, in a natural, easy, and even bountiful manner? We assert that He does not. We challenge the history of all nations during nearly 6000 years to be searched, for a single instance of such a fact. Mr. Noel, however, by his question, which we have just quoted—*“How are we to find employment for the new population from year to year?”*—evidently exhibits a bias towards an opposite opinion; and implies a fear which he does not attempt to conceal; that except *we*, in our greater wisdom, can devise some mode of employing and maintaining a supposed “surplus population,” the dreadful prospect lies before us, of seeing a large proportion of our own people actually perish of inevitable starvation.

Now, before we descend to talk of cotton-spinners and the like, we must entreat Mr. Noel to endeavour earnestly to clear his mind of false impressions as to this great fundamental point. Why will he boldly and unshrinkingly espouse a notion which is equally opposed to the word of God, and to undoubted and undeniable fact?

To the word of God: for who, that has even the twentieth part of Mr. Noel's acquaintance with it, can be ignorant that from the very first page to the very last, abundance of people is represented as a blessing, and fewness as a curse. Passages of this tenor are so numerous, or rather so continually occurring, that to cull and adduce a few, would be to lower the general weight of the evidence. They treat of the subject in every imaginable point of view—except, indeed, controversially. Never does it seem to have occurred to any of the sacred writers, as even a possible event, that men should rise up to represent the increase of the people as a calamity, and the possibility of feeding them as a difficult problem. It was reserved for the nineteenth century, or rather, for the close of the eighteenth, to raise up a series of philoso-

phers—many of them, too, believers in Scripture—who could yet close their eyes to the *whole tenor* of God's word, and learn to look upon that very thing with dread and consternation, which He constantly declares to be one of His choicest blessings!

But the supposition is equally opposed to undeniable fact. As we have already observed—the spectacle of a nation reduced to poverty and misery *by the increasing numbers of its people*, is one which the world has never yet seen; and, as Dr. Johnson observed, “we may be pardoned for not hastily believing that which has never yet happened.” But, to come to the practical part of the question,—in England and Wales we have about 37,000,000 of acres, whereof 28,000,000 are already under some kind of cultivation; and we have probably 15,000,000 of people. Is this, then, such a “crowded” population as to make us tremble for the “millions who cannot be fed?” Assuredly not.

We have already reminded Mr. Noel of the case of Palestine. That country had, probably, not more 6,000,000 of acres. Only one reign had passed, since the Philistines ravaged, and possessed the land: yet, at the close of that one reign, an enumeration of the people gave 1,300,000 men that drew sword, shewing a gross population of 6,000,000, or about *one per acre*.

Nor is there any thing remarkable in this. At the present moment the island of Jersey, with about 40,000 acres, returns a census of 47,546 inhabitants; there being no *manufacture in the island*. In like manner Mr. Coxe describes “the banks of the lake of Zurich,” as “not surpassed by any spot on the habitable globe, for the *density of the population*, and the *well-being of the peasants*. In many places,” he adds, “there is hardly an acre and a quarter to each individual.” Mr. Radcliffe, in his Report on the Agriculture of Belgium, says, of one of the departments, “there are 461,659 souls upon 302,235 hectares, which are equal to 746,521 English acres, being about five souls to eight English acres. But the population,” he adds, “is much more dense in other districts; in that of Bruges alone, at the rate of three souls to four acres; and in that of Courtrai, at the rate of one to an English acre. Notwithstanding this, one-third of the produce of the land is annually exported!” The same account is given of Lucca, the most thickly-peopled state of Italy, and by natural consequence, the most happy and prosperous. “The little state of Lucca,” says Forsyth, “is so populous, that very few acres, and those subject to inundation, are allotted to each farmer in the plain. Hence their superior skill in agriculture and draining; hence that variety of crops in every enclosure, which gives the vale of Serchio the economy and shew of a large kitchen-

garden." In short, whether we simply receive the language of Holy Writ, which constantly speaks of "numbers of people" as a blessing, or turn to the period of Israel's greatest prosperity, when with probably more than one soul to every acre in Palestine, the people are described as "eating and drinking and making merry;" or search the earth, at the present moment, for the happiest communities (economically speaking), we shall in either view be led to see that nothing like *fear* ought to be connected with the contemplation of increasing numbers; and that, if all our manufactures were to be utterly abolished, we should still be able to support in plenty at least one soul to each acre, or from 28,000,000 to 35,000,000 of people in England and Wales, being *more than twice* our present numbers.

Mr. Alison, indeed, as we have already seen, carries his hopes far beyond this; and we see no reason to question his views. Still, as Mr. Noel sees some "extraordinary errors" in them, which he does not particularize, we will not insist upon that extent. Suffice it, for the present, to say, that not the slightest fear ought to exist, on any rational ground, until our population shall have at least doubled its present amount, which it cannot do in less than *forty years*;—by which time, we believe, all fancies of a "surplus population" will have ceased to alarm mankind.

But Mr. Noel rather innocently asks, Why, if the 3,500,000 of improvable acres in England can be made to grow corn, are they not cultivated? Surely Mr. Noel cannot be ignorant of the obstacles our laws interpose; of the necessity, in all cases, of procuring a special act of parliament; and of the vicious principle always adopted in such acts, of taking the common from the poor, and dividing it among the rich. What we want, is, a few men of Mr. Noel's powers and Mr. Noel's position, to write truer "Pleas for the poor" than that which he has lately indited. Not "pleas" which tend to draw the poor man from his native soil; on which, if permitted, he might always be sure to gain his daily bread,—and to immure him in some noisome factory-town, where, idle himself, he learns perforce, to live upon the labours of his infants;—but pleas with the rich, not to regard the poor as "surplus population;" not to pull down their cottages, and drive them from their sight; but to permit them to live,—to permit them to labour,—to grant them the slight boon of a cottage and a garden; for both of which they would willingly pay the full value. The labouring poor of England want no more than this; but, strange to say, it is too often denied them. Possessed with a strange and unnatural dread of over-population, the landowner too often levels all the cottages he can; denies the poor man the least scrap of ground for a garden;

watches him as if he were a natural enemy ; and is but too happy if he can bribe or threaten him into flying to America and Australia ! And yet, strange to say, not only does he thus incur the woe denounced against those who " add house to house, and lay field to field ; till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth ; " but in good truth, if it were not for annual immigrations of labourers from the sister island, the very crops must decay on the ground for want of hands to get them in !

All this is *selfish cupidity* ; looking to our *own* pomp and (fancied) security, and caring nothing for our brother's weal. Mr. Noel should take his pen, and denounce it in the indignant strains which God's word would teach him. But no ! he is occupied in helping forward, (though with the best and kindest intentions) *selfish cupidity* of another kind.

While the landed proprietor is senselessly and wickedly driving the poor from his demesne,—the mill-owner eagerly invites them to him. Not that he wishes for the men, for our whole manufacturing system is an inversion of the order of nature. He requires only the poor children, whom he readily engages, leaving the parents to idleness and the beer-shop. Mills upon mills are built, and families upon families imported from the villages, to tend the spindles. Humanity asks, that these immature frames shall not be worked more than *twelve* hours a day, including mealtimes. But the mill-owner cannot consent to this. He is in haste to get rich, and if there is a market he will often run his mill sixteen, eighteen, or even more hours per day. This eagerness overreaches itself, and a prodigious glut of the commodity takes place. Such a glut is experienced at the present moment. This is first made to press upon the poor labourer, who suffers either from over-work when trade is brisk, or from half-starvation when it is dull.

But the stagnation increases. What then is to be done ? The mill-owner immediately proposes to sacrifice his neighbour—in hope, the slenderest of all hopes, of saving himself. If the corn laws could be repealed, a new foreign trade might spring up. This is a forlorn hope indeed. We ask, if we buy our corn abroad, instead of buying it of our own farmers, what must become of the cultivators of our fields ? The mill-owners reply, that they will take them into their service, and make manufacturers of them. The dreadful suffering involved in ruining a farmer and scattering all his labourers, in the process of driving them into the towns, is thought little of. But we must ask next, where is the least certainty of such an increase of foreign trade as to yield employment to multitudes of fresh labourers ?

At present the continental governments protect their own manu-

facturers by almost excluding our goods. Have we the least assurance from any of these governments, that they will change their policy if we admit their corn? Not a word of the kind.

But further, our goods are excluded by *the greater cheapness of their own productions*. We have adduced two eminent manufacturers, each declaring, of some great leading commodity, that the Germans could undersell us in every market in the world. The rejoinder to this, is, that "if we have only a repeal of the Corn Laws, foreigners will not be able to compete with us *in the finer goods* for many years to come."

We beg Mr. Noel's attention to the admissions and fallacies contained in this last sentence, which we have given in his own words:—

1. "If we have only a repeal of the Corn Laws, foreigners will not be able to compete with us." In what way is this repeal to affect the respective positions of English and German manufacturers?

Obviously, the hope is, that bread and wages in England will *fall*, and that bread and wages in Prussia will *rise*. But how fallacious is the idea, that any such change can take place as to affect the price of manufactured goods! Mr. McCulloch, *upon whom Mr. Noel relies*, declares that foreign wheat, with a low fixed duty, could not be sold in London under 50s. to 54s. per quarter. This would not produce a fall of 1d. per quartern loaf, from the average price in England. But a fall of only 1d. a loaf would not allow of a reduction of 1s. a week in wages. How could *this* overcome the disparity between English and German prices? In the two cases to which we adverted, manufacturers of the very first rank vouched for the fact, of a *great* difference in price, in favour of the Germans.

2. But "in the *finer goods*" they could not compete with us. Now Mr. Gregg's evidence,—and he is one of the very first manufacturers in Manchester,—distinctly stated that a German print at 15s. 6d. the piece, "*exceeded* an English one at 17s. 6d., both in *execution and work*."

We may even appeal to Mr. Noel's own eye-sight for a fact so notorious, as that the competition in our own metropolis is in the *finer* articles. A large and increasing importation is going on; and it is in "the *finer goods*" that our workmen are beaten by the foreigners. This is apparent in every street in London.

3. But Mr. Noel's informants make an awkward admission, when they tell us that *if* the Corn Laws are repealed, foreigners will not be able to compete with us in the finer articles "*for many years to come*."

What, then, the ascendancy which you promise yourselves is to be but *for a time*. You cannot deny the Swiss and Germans possess both industry and intelligence; capital moves from land to land; machinery is now universally spread; taxation is lighter on the continent than here; your project, then,—the project of *selfish cupidity*, of monopolizing the trade of the world,—can only answer, even in your own hopes, *for a period*.

But it is on a hope of this kind that we are desired to rest our principal reliance? Our poorer soils are to be allowed to drop out of cultivation; our people are to throng into the factory-towns; swelling them, already far too large, beyond their present size,—and after all, not even the sanguine hopes of the mill-owners themselves, will promise us more than *a period* of manufacturing prosperity!

Is this a rational prospect? We know, indeed, that many a mill-owner will say, without the slightest hesitation, Only let me have a good run of my mill for the next ten years, and I will leave others to care for what may come after! But Mr. Noel will not say this. We ask him, then, to ponder this fact.—that if he converts the bulk of the population in manufacturing labourers, relying upon being permitted to manufacture for all the world, and is then disappointed, *as he assuredly will be*, he has plunged the community into an abyss of wretchedness scarcely to be conceived. Whereas, if he turns his attention the other way, and allows man to fulfil his original purpose and employment—"to till the earth from whence he was taken," and "in the sweat of his brow to eat bread," he will find, if he closely examines the prospect, not the slightest danger that either bread enough or employment enough, shall, *in reality*, be wanting, for as many people as God shall please to place upon this corner of the earth.

PASTORAL ANNALS. By an IRISH CLERGYMAN. Foolscap 8vo. London: Seeley and Burnside. 1841.

THIS is unquestionably the work of a man of talent. It possesses the most indubitable of all proofs of it,—namely, that of the power of attracting and fixing the reader. Very few persons indeed who had opened the book, and read two consecutive pages, would be at all likely to lay it down, till the calls of duty compelled them. In the art of telling a story well, the author has few equals among the writers of the present day.

It is also the work of an honest man ; at least, if we may judge by the frequent instances of self-accusation with which the volume abounds. At an early page we meet with the following description of "*My First Sermon* :"—

"I had been about three months discharging the duties of the parish of which I was curate, when it at length occurred to me that I ought to compose a sermon. Till then I had deprecated self-reproach, by the plea that the discourses which I preached were much superior to any I could write, and that therefore, in using them I edified my flock more than if I resorted to what I might myself be competent to furnish.

"But the verdict of reason had all along been given in against this apology, and finally, conscience joined with reason. I felt the conviction, that I had undertaken to instruct a congregation according to the ability with which my heavenly Master had endowed me, and that I was not free merely to echo the words of other men. Some glimpses of the persuasions which have since that period revealed themselves so powerfully to my heart, had already faintly dawned. I experienced the first movement in the soul towards that indescribable spiritual communion which ought always to exist between the clergyman and his flock, and of which the pulpit is the appropriate public interpreter. I felt the approaches towards what would now be called 'magnetic relation.' In short, I felt that I began to feel with my people, and they with me. As soon as I became satisfied on those points, it followed nearly as a matter of course that I should write a sermon. An observant minister will find, that his religious conversation with his flock is in a great measure the reflection of the studies and meditations of his closet : and it were fortunate that his sermons should for the most part reflect again his conversations. These conclusions arrived at, and the sermon once begun, I was surprised at the facility with which the work proceeded. It was by an earnest perusal of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and when, by many a long conference with people in private houses, I had familiarized myself to express opinions upon its meaning, that I at last fairly engaged in the task of writing a sermon. The passage which I selected for my text was (x. 14.)—"How shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed," &c. This discourse, which I still preserve, was poor and spiritless, and little calculated to improve the hearts or understandings of the hearers. But it was the offspring of an anxious heart, and free from all self-seeking. I had no thoughts, while occupied in writing it, but those of fulfilling a duty, and at the same time of enjoying a high spiritual pleasure. It was therefore without any mortification to my vanity, that I received the conviction into my mind that it was a very indifferent performance in every way. It was, as I have said, the offspring of some pains—alas ! of few prayers !—and I felt while reciting, rather than preaching it, that my spirit went not with the words. No ; nothing passed from my lips to the ears of the congregation—for reaching their hearts was out of the question—but mere sound, the empty void of chaos.

"How truly speaketh the Apostle !—'No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost.' I was as a statue ; a mouth had I, but I spoke not, for there was no voice in it. I was inferior to the silent witnesses of the starry heavens, for they declare the glory of God. And yet I had zealously striven to perform a labour of love ; but it was manifest that I had not striven 'lawfully : ' in short, I had neglected to pray for the divine blessing upon my undertaking. An excellent friend, a few years my senior, and of the same profession, happened to be one of the audience on the occasion. He came to me as I was leaving the church, and spoke some words of kind and encouraging commendation, still with a certain reservation, which was not lost upon me ; for he added, your people will feel more what you say, as you are better known to each other. I write thus particularly and minutely concern-

ing what may seem to many persons an event of little importance, because I view it in a wholly different aspect.

“Indeed, I have often since then likened the first sermon of a minister to the receiving of a first communion. On the solemnity of feeling in either case, much of the after habit during the entire life will depend. And the solemn feeling is as a graduated index, exhibiting the amount of the preparation of the heart to meet our God. If this comparison be just, it would appear that a young minister will do wisely in deferring to compose a sermon till he has become somewhat acquainted with his people. He may declaim, or may even deliver the Gospel message with faithfulness, and in some measure with power; but till Spirit witness with Spirit, he will not taste the delights of the sweet communion of the Lord’s word—the communion of preaching.

“With many of these convictions strongly impressed upon my mind, I lament to say, that during the two or three succeeding years I devoted myself very sparingly to composition; not from general indolence, for I was sufficiently diligent in study—nor from any great distaste to the effort which the labour of composition costs—nor from lack of ambition, of which I possessed enough to have stimulated to adequate application; but from excessive diffidence, and a fastidiousness which I believe represses the energies of youth more than any other assignable cause.

“I could not subdue my apprehensions of failure, and therefore would not risk it—a foolish fear, miscalled pride; for pride it really is not, for it has no obvious, and no necessary, and seldom any actual connection with an overweening estimate of self. It is pure fear, either of ridicule or disgrace, a fear of which the most humble partake as largely as the most vain, and are incomparably more in awe of. If these pages should haply be perused by some young minister of the everlasting Gospel, whom distrust of his own capacity holds back from exertions which conscience urges him to make, the author would earnestly implore him not to refrain, but to proceed in faith and love. The judgment of the world is rarely severe on youth, nor is its verdict ever irreversible; but if it were, there is one who judgeth righteously: to that One he may commit himself with confidence and humble hope. Added to natural diffidence, was an irrepressible propensity to discursive pursuits in general literature, which marred all steady progress in that peculiar to my own profession. Perhaps in the subsequent part of my life, these habits, then so disproportionate, may have left behind them some useful fruits, as their reminiscences are far from unpleasing. In early existence, they decidedly injured the cause which a moderate use of them would have tended to promote. But who, in youth, can ‘hold high the steady scale?’ Certainly I did not. Once more I explain myself. I set down these trivial facts, because they may serve as guides to those who enter on the race of which so much has been run by me; and because men are not so diverse in disposition, as that the passions and weaknesses under which they labour, may not in a great degree be partaken of by all; and consequently common dangers are susceptible of that which most tends to avert them—honest confession.”—(pp. 48—53.)

Immediately after, we find the following continuation of this condemnatory strain, in “*The Warning*” :—

“Whether we receive each special circumstance which befalls us, in the light of a particular providence exclusively our own, on which subject I do not propose to argue here; or whether we regard the common or uncommon incidents of life merely as manifestations of those fixed laws by which God governs the world; no doubt ought to exist that they demonstrate equally the being, and the care of a superintending power. And when such incidents partake of the character of warnings, which impress the mind with much alarm, or of strange and unexpected preservations, or of chastisements, or misfortunes apparently unsuspensible of solution as of cause and effect, and (as men term them) out of the ordinary course of nature, we are the more

easily induced to discern and to acknowledge a hidden source, a power which overrules and governs all things. But this indefinite principle will not satisfy reflecting minds. The design must be fathomed. Now the design, however manifest it may be, is only practically illustrated by the issue: not of course that the issue will always reveal the design to every observer, for God does not expose his system to the carnal eye of man; but the issue does commonly so illustrate practically the design, as that many persons can draw a tolerably just inference respecting it, and all persons are led, if they will follow the divine leading, to 'consider their ways.'

"I was very emphatically called on about this time to consider mine. I had been recently collated to a benefice, my probationary period as a curate having terminated. This professional advancement was in a great measure the means of maturing, or at least of accelerating my intentions relative to forming a matrimonial alliance from which the principal happiness of my life has been derived. It is hoped that the engrossing character of the emotions which my state of mind yielded to, may in all explain, and in part fully extenuate, the misconduct I here proceed to relate.

"It was on the afternoon of a fine Sunday in June, when, having concluded divine service in the parish church of —, I was walking slowly and alone towards the house wherein I at that time sojourned, the parsonage being in progress of repair. Scarcely had I proceeded above a hundred paces, when a boy of fourteen or fifteen years of age overtook me. He was quite out of breath from running and the heat of the day, and remained for nearly a minute unable to speak from agitation. At length he hastily announced that his mother, the wife of a blacksmith, living about half a mile distant, lay at the point of death, and desired above all human things to see me, and to give the last testimony of her faith in the Redeemer. The story was calculated to rouse even a careless clergyman, and such I certainly was not: but it made only a slight impression upon me (though I did not altogether disbelieve it), because I had seen the woman two days before, and entertained no suspicion that her end was so near. My mind also being otherwise occupied, I contended myself with telling the boy that I would come to his mother by and by. The poor fellow appeared exceedingly disappointed, but made no reply. I remember, that after about the lapse of a minute, I happened to turn round, not well knowing why. My young friend still stood as I had left him, merely his face was bent towards home, and not looking after me, as might have been supposed. The circumstance soon ceasing to attract my attention, I continued my walk, and forgot it and the message together.

"An hour had scarcely expired, when the boy came again. He was sadly distressed and in tears. He prayed me to accompany him without delay. His mother, he assured me, was on the point of death. 'She is going fast, very fast indeed, Sir,' sobbed the disconsolate youth, 'and desires to see you for one moment before the breath leaves her.' When he delivered this message, I was sitting, with my head uncovered, upon the steps of the front door of the house. 'I will get my hat,' said I, 'and come presently.' 'shall I wait for you, Sir?' asked hesitatingly the weeping lad. Piqued by the implied distrust, I desired him, with some impatience of tone and manner, to go home.

"He obeyed; but as he retired, looked back several times to see whether I followed him. I retained my sitting posture, determined—poor weak creature that I was!—not to change it till he was out of sight. While thus wilfully offending against duty and conscience, I heard a rumbling noise, proceeding I could not tell from whence. At first I supposed it might be the rolling report of a signal gun from one of the ships of war in the harbour, about five miles distant; a conjecture which the next moment dissipated. It was, as I have stated, a lovely afternoon; not a breath of air disturbed the perfect calm which reigned around: hence the fact which I shall relate is the more remarkable. The rumbling sound which I had heard was occa-

sioned by a slate of the roof above me, which suddenly detaching itself, rolled down the slope, and before I was aware fell edgeways upon my unprotected head. Happily I had bent forward in the attitude of listening, and consequently presented an oblique surface to the descending mass. Had providence not so ordained it, my skull must have inevitably been cloven asunder. From such a fatal issue the Lord preserved me; but the sharp substance penetrated to the bone, and prostrated me with excessive violence upon the earth.

"I was quite stunned, and bled profusely. But oh! how was I moved, when recovering my senses, I perceived amongst the most active of four or five persons who had come to my relief, the very boy whose entreaties I had so unfeelingly disregarded.

"It was he indeed who had given the first alarm, for he had seen the slate fall, and instantly ran back. While he staid beside me, rendering such services as he could, his sister, a child of ten years of age, came crying up the avenue, sent to make a last appeal to the procrastinating minister. Alas! the time was gone by when that appeal could be responded to—'The harvest was past, the summer was ended,'—the poor woman remained without a pastor. To the child, whom her brother signed to hold her peace, I could give no answer; to the mother I had denied the consolation which it was no longer in my power to bestow. *My* spirit accused me with justice of a flagrant dereliction of trust; and as the thunder-clouds of self-reproach burst upon my terrified conscience, *hers* returned to the God who gave it.

"My wound, though deep, was not dangerous, nor was the cure protracted beyond three or four days: that short period was sufficient to restore my bodily health. Far otherwise was it with my mental part. During my confinement I suffered extreme anguish of spirit. I tried to allay it, sometimes by prayer, sometimes by seeking palliatives for my conduct through every imaginable pretext. But none of them satisfied me. My days dragged on heavily amidst the torments of conscious omission of duty—my nights were far worse. Unable to sleep, from a dull sensation of headache, the spectacle, or rather the spectre of her I had so inexcusably abandoned, haunted my waking thoughts. Like the impression which the bloody death I had seen a few months before made upon my imagination, so now this death, which I had not seen, took strong possession of it.

"I thought that she had left her dying bed and come to mine. Again and again I fancied that I looked upon her pale countenance, as she sat beside my pillow, and mildly, if I may use the expression, frowned upon me as I lay. Now I well knew the whole time that these ideas were unreal, and no more than mere phantoms of the diseased mind. But I could not minister to it, nor pluck from memory the rooted sorrow which still remained unextirpated. Distressed beyond endurance by those visions which the periodical return of fever at eventide brought with it, I directed that a night-lamp should be placed in my chamber. Many find this a sovereign remedy against nightly fears; upon me the effect was quite opposite. A month of my then state of bodily and mental excitement, and I had become a confirmed Swedenborgian, so far as believing that I held converse with departed men.

"Whether it were that the flickering flame of the lamp cast varied shadows around, or that a crisis had come, I know not. This I do know, that I embodied every shadow, and set them before me upon as many chairs as creative fancy could assemble.

"My conversations with these people, as may be supposed, were highly animated, but not very profitable; yet I received many answers and assurances from my company. But time rolled on, and obliterated day by day some one phantom of the brain, and weakened at the same time the force of self-reproach. In short, I recovered full health and partial spirits; for the withers of conscience had been sorely wrung. My reflections were very painful and self-accusing, and though, indeed, I prayed much, still the exercise brought little comfort—the Spirit had not come. The truth is, my sup-

plications were rather deprecatory, than enjoyed as the richest and most sublime privilege bestowed on man. I spoke to my God, but not with him. There was no speaking face to face, as a man speaketh to his friend, but merely a crying for mercy from afar—the beating upon the breast of the penitent sinner, not the hosannas of the believer rejoicing in hope. My mind was therefore a theatre in which conflicting feelings wrestled—a sea where the four winds struggled for mastery.

“ I suffered exceedingly at the time; but subsequent experience has taught me, that these strong emotions are generally the prelude to sober and wholesome convictions. The storm blows by—a gentle breeze remains, the pleasing vestige of the elemental rage by which we had been alarmed. I rejoice now—I rejoiced even then, that I felt such profound sorrow. I think it is very advisable to cultivate such feelings, when circumstanced as I was then. The sorrow which a sense of neglected duty inspires, may torment for a season, but bright beams of hope shoot from behind its darkest clouds, and tell to the afflicted soul the tidings of happier days. So certainly was it, and often since has it been with me. The first use I made of my convalescence was to visit the widower. To my surprise, and I may add confusion, he received me with unbounded cordiality, testifying the deepest gratification at my recovery, and the universal regret the parishioners had felt when the account of the accident I had met with became known. Still, beneath these external demonstrations some hidden sentiment at variance with his professions must have lurked. He spoke of his sorrow for the loss he had suffered, and of the religious disposition of his deceased partner; but not a word of her latter moments, nor did he make any allusion to her desire of seeing me. This might have been delicate forbearance—or perhaps conscience made me suspicious, and that was all mere accident. But then he spoke of the fright his son had experienced at sight of my accident,—that bore somewhat upon the question, and probed the wound. However, the general impression made upon my mind was that of thankfulness for the feeling consideration which he evinced; and truly his reception of me heaped coals of fire upon my head.

“ After submitting to this torture for some few minutes, I freely confessed my fault, and asked his forgiveness. Poor fellow! he appeared willing enough to forgive, but I had touched a tender string, which vibrated in his heart's core. Bitterly did he weep, and loudly bewail the dispensation with which it had pleased God to try him. Overcome by the recollection of twenty years of cloudless happiness, he remained for a long time a prey to irrepressible bursts of affliction. By degrees they subsided; and when he felt himself sufficiently composed to speak distinctly, he sobbed out—‘ Oh! dear sir, I cannot take upon myself to forgive my teacher.’

“ The words were, I believe, spoken in the purest singleness of intention, and with unfeigned humility: but I was fully sensible how much more they meant than he intended to express. They absolutely made me start. Forgive my teacher! Again and again I pondered upon the phrase,—and the more I thought on it, the deeper it sunk. Forgive my teacher! ‘ You won't take upon yourself,’ I inwardly exclaimed, ‘ to forgive him, because you know that the account is between God and his soul, and that it is not yours to deal with.’ No! the poor man did not think so, and I am sure that if he had, he would have gladly prayed for me. He merely felt that I was too much above him to require his forgiveness; while I, in heart, confessed myself so far below him, as earnestly to desire both his forgiveness and his prayers. And I have lived to receive both. Two years had scarce fulfilled their course, when he too was summoned to depart, and pass into ‘ the land where all things are forgotten.’ Before his day arrived, he had become a changed character. When it had come, he left this world rejoicing in hope. His last words were a fervent entreaty that God would bless my labours in the parish; and as I held his clammy hands in mine, we exchanged a final blessing.

"Few reflections can be required upon the narrative of so very simple an incident. In the criminality of selfish delay all mankind are agreed. Such undoubtedly was mine. A merciful God has, I trust, sent an answer of peace to the sighings of a contrite heart, and not withheld the full measure of his love from her whom a negligent minister deprived of the dying glory of professing her reliance upon her Redeemer's sacrifice."—(pp. 54—64.)

A singular contrast, however, is immediately presented in a chapter entitled "*The Rats*;" in the whole of which the reader wonders, and is disappointed, to find, that the author never once rises above his subject. Rats, and nothing else than rats and rat-holes occupy the whole of a narrative of sixteen pages!

The same singular mixture of the solemn and the ludicrous, occurs again and again. Here is an incident in the death of a Chelsea pensioner:—

" 'Tell your story, my dear friend,' said I, 'for you have little time to spare; tell it, provided it do not lead you away from God.' 'It will lead me rather to him, sir,' rejoined the serjeant: 'here it is.—The division of our army to which I belonged had been ordered to attack a strongly posted body of the French. Our officers and men conducted themselves with the usual bravery of British troops, but we found ourselves unequal to the difficulties of the task assigned us; so, after a desperate struggle and heavy loss, we were compelled to retreat rather in disorder.

"A most magnificent squadron of heavy dragoons, somewhat like our Germans, galloped towards our square. We fully expected them to charge us, when suddenly they were halted by sound of trumpet, at about a hundred yards distance. The trumpeter appeared at the same moment in front of the troop, either such being his station, or carried there against his will by the very unruly animal he rode, and could scarcely restrain from dashing head-long upon our points. This splendid charger was snow-white, with flowing mane and tail—in truth, one of the most striking creatures I had ever seen. All our men remarked him; some of them wished to fire, and bring down him and his rider, but the orders were positive against discharging our pieces.

" 'The resemblance to death upon the pale horse, in the book of Revelations, arose in my mind—and not in mine alone, for while I was musing upon the coincidence, my comrade behind me, said, 'There is death upon the pale horse: the trumpet has sounded for me; if it sound again, I'm gone.' Scarcely had he spoken, when the trumpet sounded—the next moment the poor fellow dropped down dead, shot through the heart by the fire from the hill. I was, as you may easily imagine, much affected by this occurrence, and of course incurably confirmed in my habit of personifying. My slain friend was perhaps the most religious man in our company, and we had several good Christians among us. He never stirred without having a small Bible about him. I knew this, and stooping down, took it from his pocket—and here it is.'

"He was apparently going to detail the events of that memorable day, when I interrupted him by asking him whether he himself had ever received a similar warning to that of his comrade on the field of battle.—'*Not on the field of battle*,' he replied. 'Where else?' said I. He sighed heavily, without answering. I reiterated the question. 'In your garden, sir, this morning,' said my dying respondent, 'Yes, sir, I saw in your garden this morning, plainly as eyes can see and know any object, the very same trumpeter, mounted on the white horse he rode at Salamanca—and he sounded for me!'

"That there were natural causes sufficient to account for this phantom of the brain, whoever has read the preceding part of this narrative will have easily perceived. I was not, however, the less profoundly impressed with the

peculiarity of the relationship in which I stood towards the departing man. I therefore remained silent for a few moments, earnestly seeking direction from on high, how most fittingly to discharge the duties of my office with good effect.

"At the close of brief meditation and prayer, I said that I was not much inclined to look for particular warnings of death; for that, as all men knew that they must die, so all men had therefore a sufficient general warning always whispering that important truth in their ears;—that he, and every one else who believed in the divine revelation of a future life, might infer the necessity of being prepared for it, simply by observing the mortal condition of human nature. He asked, 'Did I think that if a person received a warning, which to himself seemed special, he should disregard it?' I replied, 'Certainly not; that, for example, sickness was a special warning to the individual, which he was bound by the word of scripture to observe.' I avoided hinting that what he had seen in my garden might perhaps have been merely an illusion of the brain, occasioned by illness,—fearing to excite him, and possibly raise a dispute between us. Many excellent opportunities of restoring to sound judgment persons labouring under hallucinations, are lost, through the ill-considered practice of contesting the *matter of fact* with them. I take upon me to affirm, that the *matter of fact* which they assert should always be conceded to them in the first instance, and *then* absurd or contradictory consequences deduced, through which the error may become apparent to the deceived individual. But though, in the instance before me, I abstained from argument, he manifestly felt that his declaration ought not to be believed without some further assurance. He was disposed to substantiate the averment by detailed explanation, when I cut him short by saying that I did not consider the last appearance in the garden of much importance; that we all might be particularly warned to prepare for death, or merely of our death, according as it pleased God to act towards us, either in effecting our conversion, or simply demonstrating his presence and power. He said, that he was of course acquainted with the gospel precept, to be 'always ready,' but still loved to imagine *himself* the subject of special warning. The secret of our common weakness escaped him in that word *self*. He hoped to find himself the object of special, particular care here, as a species of earnest of the favour he might expect to experience hereafter. Much may be said, as all the world knows, in defence of the view he had adopted; more still, as relates to his holding it with tenacity, when the extraordinary manner in which he first received it is remembered. Who could be surprised that he should cling to the phantom, if it is fair to call it so, or the conviction, when conviction it truly was, with all that irrepressible fidelity which cherishes to the last our long-indulged prepossessions? It was plain that he looked upon himself as a doomed man, whose life no human art could prolong: hence he exhibited extreme reluctance to admit of my remedies, although so much relieved by those I had already administered. * * * * *

"The coming of the doctor was delayed to a period much beyond what I had calculated on. The night was already far advanced before he arrived, and death had meanwhile not slackened in his course. The pensioner was awake, and perfectly collected; but his extremities were cold, his pulse feeble and irregular, with great restlessness, and that peculiar anxiety of countenance which betokens the setting in of mortification. To all our entreaties, that even under the hopelessness of his case some means might yet be resorted to, he opposed a firm refusal, expressing a desire to be left alone with me. When that wish was acceded to, he seemed much pleased, and without loss of time entered on a detail of certain incidents and actions of his early life, the rectitude of which he was not satisfied with. He had not fulfilled the strictness of the moral law in the points he related: still his crimes were far from grievous, and his observations upon them evinced a habit of self-examination, and a tenderness of conscience highly praiseworthy, and much surpassing my estimate of his

character. These matters ended, he joined with me in prayer, calling with extreme earnestness on the Lord Jesus to receive his spirit. During the momentary pauses of our supplication, I was surprised to hear him pronounce the words *trumpet* and *trumpeter* in a low tone, and on rising from my knees I asked him the reason? He said, 'that the French trumpeter had rode into the room while we were praying, and sounded his trumpet—first, a single note, very deep and solemn—again, after some delay, another more shrill, twice repeated.' I inquired of him, had he *heard* the trumpet? He seemed rather embarrassed by the question, of which he perceived the drift, and answered, under the influence of slight excitement, 'that he knew how to distinguish the high notes from the low, by the manner in which the trumpeter moved the muscles of his face.' I asked, 'Whether did he most resemble a man or an angel?' He answered, 'An angel, certainly.' I pursued—'A good or a bad angel?' He said, that the appearance which he saw, suggested no idea either of good or evil to his mind, the impression being merely that of great power. 'Was it so,' said I, 'at Salamanca?'—'Yes,' he replied. I then asked if the trumpeter had looked at him particularly on that victorious day? 'Yes, sir,' replied he; 'so very fixedly did he look upon me, that I am confident I could not have summoned resolution to level my piece at him, his eyes glared so.' This conversation, though mixed with other and better topics, was not very profitable; but the truth is, I could not repress my curiosity—or may I stand excused if I call it, justifiable interest in a philosophical question? I ventured finally on the last interrogatory—'Did he expect to see the trumpeter again?'—'Undoubtedly,' answered the dying man, in a faint voice—'I shall see him again—He will sound thrice, and I shall then follow my comrade.' He turned more towards me in his bed as he spoke these words, and took my hand in his, as if preparing himself for some event, without however making any observation. Life was now fast ebbing; respiration became every moment more difficult, and low confused mutterings announced that the rational faculty was taking wing to happier regions. He was still, however, self-possessed at intervals, and apparently at such periods earnest in devotion, for he did not speak aloud. This scene lasted about a quarter of an hour. At the termination of it, he extended his arm to take again in his, the hand which I had unintentionally withdrawn—pressed it distinctly *three times*—looked towards the door of the room with an indescribable expression of countenance, then staringly in my face—strove to say something, but could not—sobbed heavily, and expired.'—(pp. 297—305.)

But this is speedily followed by "*the Tithe-setting*," which is worthy to rank with Cowper's "*Tithing-time in Essex*."

There is doubtless much of Irish character in this. A vein of humour and natural drollery seems almost inseparable from an Irishman's organization; and when enriched and deepened by real talent, it must inevitably prove a constant temptation to its possessor. Probably, among Englishmen, the far larger proportion of whom are dull, heavy, matter-of-fact sort of people, this *trait* will diminish the popularity of "*Pastoral Annals*." They like a book to be *either* serious, or comic; but not both. The higher and more important question of the entire consistency of so broad a vein of humour with the ministerial character, we only suggest. Accurately to draw the line, and to decide whether, and how far our present author has transgressed the line of propriety, would require more time and space than we are able to bestow.

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

NOVEMBER, 1841.

AN ENQUIRY INTO THE POSSIBILITY OF OBTAINING MEANS FOR CHURCH EXTENSION, WITHOUT PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS. By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford. London: *Rivingtons*. 1841.

IN our last number we adverted to the very interesting but equally perplexing subject of Church Extension; or, as Mr. Gresley prefers the phrase, of the "Restoration of the National Church." Part of the learned Prebendary's pamphlet was supplied by his friend Mr. Palmer, of Worcester College, Oxford; who has since emerged from behind the shield of the greater Ajax, assumed his proper weapon, and presented himself openly as a leader of the phalanx of Church Restorers. His first shaft, levelled at the Dagon of ultra-Protestantism, is intituled, an "Enquiry into the Possibility of Obtaining Means for Church Extension, without Parliamentary Grants." Mr. Gresley first proves the necessity of attempting a restoration of the Church; and lest John Bull, always nervously sensitive when his pocket is in jeopardy, should take fright at the prospect of being called upon to supply the material, Mr. Palmer undertakes to soothe the apprehensions of the irritable old gentleman, by assuring him that the means are already abundantly provided—if he only knew where to look for them. We strongly suspect, however, that Mr. Palmer's expedient for paying Peter will be found, when carefully and dispassionately

examined, nothing better than a plan for robbing Paul. We entirely agree with him as to the desirableness of increasing the number of Bishops: *this* indeed we consider an indispensable preliminary and adjunct to any effectual scheme of Church extension; but if the incomes of additional Bishops and the stipends of additional Curates are only to be provided by imposing new burdens upon those who are already laden as heavily as they can bear, we see nothing before us but a choice of evils, and very greatly doubt whether, in increasing the existing number of Bishops and of Clergymen, we should choose the less. Not to anticipate, however, we will first set before our readers the detail of Mr. Palmer's plan, and then proceed to the statement of our objections.

"We are now to examine the remaining part of the subject—the provision for 4000 curates and deacons. We will suppose that 2000 of each would be sufficient, and that the incomes of the former may be placed at £100 per annum each, and the latter at £75 per annum. The total amount requisite for their salaries would then be £350,000 per annum.

"To meet this charge, it seems to me that there are two measures within the power of the Church, which would probably be found sufficient for all that could be wanted.

"(1.) The first is that which has been recommended by Mr. Gresley, as it has also been by Archdeacon Wilberforce, and many other clergymen—the adoption or revival of the practice of Sunday collections during the time of divine service. The Sunday offertory is, in fact, prescribed in the rubric of our own Prayer Book. It certainly prevailed in the primitive Church, and was generally adopted for many ages. In Ireland it is universally the custom to make collections of alms in Church immediately before the sermon every Sunday; and this collection, which is always distributed amongst the poor, is, in some places, so considerable, that I have been credibly informed, that £3 or £4 per Sunday, or even more, is collected in certain churches.

"The simple fact of the universal existence of this practice, in so poor a country as Ireland, would seem to demonstrate the possibility of introducing a similar measure into England, with a view to obtaining funds for Church Extension. Considering the great amount of wealth in this country, and, I must add, the charitable and liberal disposition of a large portion of our congregations, I cannot think there would be any difficulty in introducing the practice, with so holy and religious an object in view. Where the contribution was voluntary, and was urged and recommended on religious motives, it would surely be difficult to imagine on what grounds Christian congregations could object to it. It may be said, that the amount would be insignificant, and that many persons would not contribute to this fund. It is possible that some little time might be requisite to instruct our congregations in their duties in reference to the subject, but it is one which is so deeply connected with religious considerations, that if the clergy were obliged to bring it continually before the consciences of their hearers, it is morally impossible that there could be any failure.

"In fact, several clergy in various parts of the country have, without the least difficulty, restored the practice of Sunday collections in Church. One clergyman mentioned to me lately, that the collections in his church (which are applied to the erection of a new church) average more than £4 each Sunday.

"If there has been no difficulty in establishing the practice in these cases, its general adoption would be still more certain, and its productiveness more secured, by the authority of an Act of Parliament, aided by royal letters,

pastoral letters from the Archbishops and Bishops (occasionally repeated), and by the sermons and exhortations of the whole clergy.

“ With a view to estimate the probable amount of the fund which might be derivable from this source, I have endeavoured in vain to find a return, which appears to have been made to the House of Commons in May, 1830 or 1831, being an account of the collections made for the poor in the churches of Ireland from 1825 to 1829. This return has not been printed in the Parliamentary Papers, and after a long search (in which I have to acknowledge the kind assistance of Sir Robert Inglis), it seems that the paper in question probably perished in the conflagration of the Houses of Parliament.

“ I have, however, made inquiries in various quarters relative to the amount of these collections, and on the whole it seems probable, that about five shillings per Sunday is the average collection in each church.

“ If we suppose every church in England and Wales contributing at the same rate as is customary in Ireland, we should obtain an income of £156,000 per annum, for the churches in this country do not fall short of 12,000. If we suppose the average to be 7s. 6d. per Sunday, which might be fairly expected from the greater wealth of this country, we should have an income of £234,000; and if the average were 10s. per Sunday, which would not be impossible, we should have £312,000 per annum.”—(pp. 17—20)

Without the fund thus obtained, Mr. Palmer's plan could not be carried into effect; and if, therefore, we can prove that there is no hope of obtaining it, his scheme for relieving the Legislature from their collective responsibility, and exonerating the representatives of Christian constituents from their personal duty and obligation, will fall to the ground. Our objection to his project, as stated generally in our last number, arranged itself under three heads, which we repeat: first, that we believed his proposed means, as here stated, to be impracticable; secondly, that we considered them to be inexpedient, and, thirdly, that we knew them to be unjust.

First, we believe Mr. Palmer's project of congregational collections to be impracticable—not in respect of the collections themselves, but of the purposes for which they are to be applied. The case of Ireland, which Mr. Palmer cites, is not analogous. True, the collection is always distributed among the poor, and the channel through which the distribution is made is, as it ought to be, the parochial clergy. But we do not think it would be expedient to transfer the distribution of the funds thus collected from those of whom the donors have personal knowledge, and in whom generally they repose implicit confidence (a confidence, we believe, very rarely misplaced) to a conclave of commissioners, lay or clerical, with whom they have no acquaintance whatever, and in whose proceedings they take therefore little interest. Such a scheme would tend to dry up the very sources of Christian benevolence. And such an alienation of their funds would be most unjust to those who, in the immediate neighbourhood, require relief, as well as to the local and parochial charities which continually demand

support. The regular congregational collection would neutralize, if it did not supersede, every appeal on behalf of a specific object, and thus, by caring generally for the Church at large, but not especially for "those of our own house," we should be placed in a position too closely resembling that of him who, in the language of the Apostle, "has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

Mr. Palmer indeed endeavours to obviate this objection, by speaking of "one clergyman, who assured him lately, that the collections in his Church (which are applied to the erection of a new church) average more than £4. each Sunday." But Mr. Palmer does *not* tell us two things, which yet are necessary to be known, before we can regard this as an adjudged case, and as a case in point: first, whether the new church was or was not locally connected with the congregation, and, secondly, if local and parochial charities existed, how were their funds supplied?—If the church in question was thus connected with the contributing congregation, the instance makes against Mr. Palmer's theory rather than in support of it, the object being strictly local; if, next, there existed no local and parochial charities, which had a prior, or, at least, an equal claim, this is not a fair average specimen of congregations—and, again, if there were, and they were impoverished or neglected, Mr. P. will hardly recommend this as an example for the imitation of the Church. We know that there are many, very many parishes, which are rather in a condition to solicit aid than to impart it; we know of one parish containing 13,000, and another containing 40,000 inhabitants, within each of which we have been assured by the respective Incumbents, that there is but one resident family of circumstances sufficiently affluent to maintain a single male servant; and how these are to contribute, in Mr. Palmer's proportion, to a general fund, or to any fund, while in the second and larger parish there is only a single church (another is on the eve of consecration) we really cannot conceive. And if it be replied that this last is only a single instance, we reply, that it is an instance quite as much to the point as the single one which Mr. Palmer has selected, and that, were it needed, we could easily multiply examples to an equal extent with himself. We can, however, return another answer, which will at once overturn all the sanguine expectations of Mr. Palmer, and that on the highest authority in ecclesiastical statistics—the authority of a Prelate of whom it has been well said, that he oversees everything, but overlooks nothing—the indefatigable Bishop of London.

"There are," said his Lordship, in the Appendix to his admirable Sermons on the Uses of a standing Ministry in the Established Church, "there are in England and Wales 6,681 parishes, each

with a population not exceeding 300 persons ; of these, 1907 have each a population of less than 100." Mr. Palmer reckons the gross number of churches at 12,000. Now, if we examine the Reports of any of the three Societies which obtain, in triennial cycle, a royal letter enjoining a single collection in every church and chapel, in aid of these objects, we shall find that the return for sometimes one half of the parishes in a Diocese is *nothing*, and that no inconsiderable proportion of the remainder are below Mr. Palmer's average of 7s. 6d.* His calculation, therefore, even supposing that no conflicting claims, no counteracting circumstances, no pressing local institutions, absorbing, and more than absorbing, all local resources, prevented its adoption in any church, would produce little more than half the larger sum on which he reckons ; but if it were restricted, as it ought to be, to those parishes and congregations, which either have no immediate claim upon their sympathy and succour, or which have so discharged that specific claim as to obtain for themselves the privilege of lengthening the cords and strengthening the stakes of the Universal Church, the "true Tabernacle which God pitched, and not man," we doubt whether he would obtain even £10,000 per annum, and we more than fear, that what he *did* obtain would be subtracted from the funds of those societies, whose aim is to promote the diffusion of Evangelical truth abroad, or the increase of pastoral superintendence at home. In this way, therefore, nothing considerable can be expected ; we think that even to make the attempt would be inexpedient in the extreme,—and, without venturing to assume to ourselves the prophetic mantle, we feel perfectly assured that it would fail. Let the weekly collection be resumed, if the Prelates will provide for uniformity of practice by enjoining it in every diocese ; but that it may effectually obviate the inconvenience and interruption of charity sermons, let it be applied in the first instance to purposes strictly parochial, and let the clergy be themselves the judges how far there is a surplus ; let the surplus be transmitted to the Bishop of the Diocese, or some officer appointed by him, to be divided in equal portions between the two great objects of purifying Christianity at home and promoting it abroad ; and thus there would be, at no long interval, an ample, and, we may believe, a continually increasing fund : but let not Mr. Palmer recommend a twofold injustice in the compulsory alternative of parochial collections—an injustice to the clergy, who must then too often behold, without

* On referring to the Report of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1839, which contains an account of the collections under the Queen's Letter of June 18, 1838, we have found by actual enumeration, that in the single diocese of Norwich no less than 426 parishes contributed less than 7s. 6d., and that the return from upwards of 300 was literally *nil*.

being able to relieve, the wants of their poorer parishioners, and an injustice to the parishioners themselves, if the old women of Little Pinchington or Starveton cum Scarecrow are to be deprived of their accustomed alms, in order to maintain additional Curates at St. George's in the East or St. John's in the West. The first principle of Christian exertion is, and ought to be, "Let every one bear his own burden;" and the second, "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." Mr. Palmer seems to us so intent upon advocating the second of these duties, as to be unmindful of the first; but we will venture to say that *he* has no right to share the burden of another, who is not first found equal to the support and endurance of his own.

Mr. Palmer's second measure may be dismissed with less ceremony, partly because the amount to be produced by it is much smaller; and partly because it does not appear liable to the same objection, on the ground at least of *injustice*. Mr. Palmer assumes that there are 2000 parishes in England, where the salary of the parish clerk exceeds or equals £40 per annum—and he proposes, on the next vacancy, to suppress, in all such parishes, the office of parish clerk, and to licence a Deacon, whose salary shall be made up to £75 out of the Sunday Collection Fund. This really seems feasible, as the surplus collections of the wealthier parishes would probably suffice to make up the stipend of all Deacons of the class to £75 annually: but Mr. Palmer does not state whether he would dispense, or rather whether he would desire that the Bishops should dispense, in the case of Deacons thus appointed, with the academical degree. We consider that it would be an excellent mode of providing for the Deacons who should be educated at the two Provincial Theological Colleges, of which we spoke in our number for September (p. 494), and it has the further recommendation of needing no application to or interference of the Legislature—nor yet involving any infringement or encroachment on the existing rights of the clergy. It would require only an intimation from the Bishops that they were willing, in the case of all such vacancies, to ordain as Deacon a fit and proper person, to be nominated by the Incumbent. An opening would be thus afforded for the introduction, annually, of forty or fifty additional Ministers into the Church; a number, small indeed, when compared with her necessities, yet which might be the first step towards a further increase—a step too perfectly safe, and which there would be no conceivable danger of being compelled to retrace. We hope that this suggestion will meet in influential quarters with the attention which it deserves. We are not aware of a single instance in which it would require any deviation from the rubric, or occasion any

perplexing and vexatious interference with existing arrangements. There is no part of the parish-clerk's duty which might not be appropriately performed by a clerk in orders; and if the office itself has fallen into disrepute, this would afford a most favourable opportunity to render it honourable, after the fashion of Epaminondas, by the manner in which its duties are discharged.

Agreeing however as we clearly do with Mr. Palmer, that "4000 Curates and Deacons are required," though somewhat differing from him as to the mode in which the deficiency should be supplied, it may be expected that we should ourselves indicate a remedy; and in so doing, we need not stand upon the same punctilio as the great physician of the State, who, in the recent attack upon the Constitution, declined to prescribe until he was regularly called in. The very publication of a nostrum is itself sufficient invitation to a reviewer, who is sheltered by his convenient *incognito* against the imputation of empiricism. We do not sympathize in Mr. Palmer's nervous anxiety to spare the pocket of John Bull; we think that the old gentleman may fairly be called upon to pay the penalty of his own dilatoriness and procrastination; and we entertain too good an opinion of his principles, notwithstanding the portentous growl which he emits when any movement is made towards the repository of his money-bags, to suppose that if he were fairly convicted of an error, he would be unwilling, at whatever cost, to repair it. Besides, there is an *argumentum ad crumenam* which, notwithstanding his proverbial obtuseness, he is remarkably quick to apprehend. The grant of one million, or even half a million, annually, for purposes of Church extension, which would scarcely be perceived even by the poorest of those upon whom it was levied, would, it may be presumed, operate, after the lapse of a few years, a more than proportionate reduction in the penal and protective expenditure of the country; and we heartily wish that some competent person, like Mr. Gresley or Mr. Palmer, would collect some documentary information on this subject. We should be glad to take certain districts, in which there has been an overwhelming population and a proportionate deficiency of the parochial ministrations and pastoral superintendence of the Church, and compare them with others in which the population has been equal, but where there has been—we will not say, *no* deficiency—but a deficiency less marked and lamentable.

The diocese of Chester contains 580 Churches and Chapels, and a population of 1,902,254, about one Church or Chapel to 3200 inhabitants. Proportion of offenders to the population;—Lancashire, 1 in 481; Cheshire, 1 in 492; average, 1 in 486.

The diocese of Exeter contains 711 Churches and Chapels, and a population of 773,251, nearly one Church or Chapel to 1000 inhabitants. Proportion of offenders to the population ;—Devonshire, 1 in 881; Cornwall, 1 in 1406; average, 1 in about 1200.

Whether the connection between cause and effect be admitted in this instance, or not, the result is very striking. Crime, punishable by the laws, and involving a portion of the penal expenditure of the country (to say nothing of the protective), varies in these two dioceses in the inverse ratio of parochial ministrations and pastoral superintendence. If, then, at the public cost, the Churches and Chapels in Lancashire and Cheshire were made to bear the same proportion to the population as in Devonshire and Cornwall, and committals and penalties were to decrease in a corresponding ratio, whether would the State be a gainer or a loser, in a pecuniary sense, at the expiration of the shortest period in which the experiment could be fairly tried—that of a generation, or thirty years?

This, however, it may be said is a single instance. We will therefore take another, in which the result, though less striking, is equally convincing; and we select this instance, as the preceding, because the divisions of the dioceses are nearly identical with those of the counties which they contain.

The diocese of Worcester contains the counties of Worcester and Warwick. Churches and Chapels, 416; population, 573,000; about 1 Church or Chapel to every 1400. Population of offenders, Warwick (including Birmingham), 1 in 510; Worcester, 1 in 561; average, 1 in 530.

The diocese of Chichester contains the single county of Sussex. Churches and Chapels, 802; population, 230,950; about 1 church or chapel to every 800. Proportion of offenders, 1 in 675; about one-fourth less.

When to this we add the fact, that the proportion is highest in those dioceses where there is notoriously the greatest deficiency of Church accommodation; that in the county of Middlesex, containing the city too accurately described in the quaint language of Juvenal, as

——— “ the common shore,

Where (earth) does all her filth and ordure pour,

the proportion is 1 in 336, and in Surrey 1 in 464, we think we may fearlessly say, *probatum est*. What proportion of these offenders emerge out of the dark places of Shoreditch, Bethnal-green, St. George's Southwark, and St. Mary Newington, where there is upon an average about one Church or Chapel to 20,000 souls, we are not able to say; but we think that the man would do good service both to Church and State who would take the

trouble to investigate, and fairly set before the country the leading features of its moral statistics. We are much mistaken if the result would not be to convince that shadowy though substantial representative of the English people, John Bull himself, that a judicious scheme of Church extension, which would occupy the surface of the country with a parochial ministry and pastoral superintendence, would be the best plan that could possibly be devised for the reduction of the public burdens; and that for every million thus expended, a twofold or a tenfold saving might reasonably be anticipated in future years—an anticipation, resting not on the precarious calculations of a sanguine temperament, but on the solid foundation of actual experience. And it is also a consideration, of subordinate interest perhaps to the Legislature, but of surpassing and supreme importance to those members of it who still acknowledge a superintending Providence, and believe in a Divine Redeemer, that in proportion to the diminution of the national expenditure would be the increase of social and domestic happiness; if at least it be truly said, and by a Voice worthy to be heard in the high places of the Legislature, “that happy is the nation that is in such a case—yea, blessed are the people that have the Lord for their God.”

Reverting then to this low financial view of the subject, we decline to occupy ourselves, with Mr. Palmer, in fabricating new schemes, or disinterring schemes defunct, for “obtaining the means of Church Extension without Parliamentary Grants:”—if the House of Commons is, what we call it, “the great council of the nation assembled in parliament,” to consult for the national honour and provide for the public weal, we think that it is far more honest, more decent, and we should not be surprised if in the end it prove more politic, to go before parliament, fortified with facts and documents like these, and to plead, in a modest but manly tone, for the recognition, by our representatives, of the people’s common interest and paramount obligation. Church extension ought not to be confounded with ordinary schemes of state policy—it stands upon a basis peculiar to itself—it does not indeed discard, nor does it in the slightest degree deprecate or dread, considerations of political economy and expediency, but it takes its post upon the vantage ground of duty;—of positive, peremptory, paramount obligation. The representatives of a people, among whom Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land, are bound to provide that none shall remain in ignorance of the requirements and sanctions of that law. They may, if they please, dissolve the connection between the Church and the State, but, until they are prepared to do this, they are bound to make the

Church effectual for its avowed and recognized purposes, just as they are bound to provide for the protection of property, liberty, and life;—and if no expense be grudged to keep down the first symptoms of an outbreak on the part of a discontented and destitute population, why is it not judged equally needful to guard against the occurrence of the evil, by taking from those who are implicated in it the excuse of that ignorance, which makes them the tools of the designing, the instruments of the disloyal, and sometimes, the victims of the traitor and the tempter? Were it only an experiment, how far the penal and protective expenditure of the country would be diminished by the increase of sacred edifices and sacred ministrations—by the schools which invariably make their appearance in the train of new churches, oftentimes without any appeal to funds which may be termed public, but provided from experience of the benefit of Christian instruction, by those who have been but recently taught to appreciate it for themselves, we think, that in the present circumstances of the country, the trial were indeed well worth the million or millions it might cost. But we are strongly inclined to believe, that by the exercise of a little diligence and research: by examining into the present condition of such districts and parishes as within the last twenty or thirty years have received the requisite increase of church accommodation and contrasting them with what they were, in their state of comparative feebleness—it might be clearly and conclusively demonstrated, that this is *not* an experiment, (at least if we are to understand that word as implying the possibility of failure,) but simply the application, on a larger scale, of that which has already been tried in the balances, and so far as it has been tried, has not been found wanting. It is needless to say that we do not attribute this result to the mere brick and mortar which compose the material of the building; but to the spirit of Church feeling which, after consecration, seems to inhabit it; calling forth, even under the most untoward and unpromising circumstances, and in the most unfavourable districts, a measure of Church union, which, however falling short of what it might be, and ought to be, at least accomplishes things unattempted before. We could, were it needed, multiply examples of this. We could point to a district in the eastern suburbs of the metropolis, containing a population of about 10,000, which, prior to the erection and consecration of a new Church, was removed scarcely by a single degree from the proverbial demoralization, debasement, and ungodliness of Bethnal-Green—no provision whatever existing for the Christian instruction of the hundreds of children, who were growing up as their fathers, a corrupt and perverse generation, and not more than one in one

hundred of the entire population ever entering, it is believed, a Christian place of worship—no man caring for their souls, and they, least of all, disposed to care for their own. The Church has now been opened about five years—the zealous and unwearied Prelate, to whom this colony of heathens was indebted for the erection of the sacred edifice, has selected for the minister of it a young clergyman precisely after his own model—an active, enterprising, devoted, indefatigable parish priest—one of the class who

“Deem nothing done, while aught remains to do;”

and within the single *lustrum* of his incumbency, schools have been erected at the expense of several thousand pounds, wherein nearly 800 children are instructed on the national system—a congregation approaching more nearly to two than to one thousand, is collected within the Church every Sabbath day; considerable funds have been raised, not only to supply local necessities, but to promote pious and philanthropic objects in distant lands—and, almost while we are speaking, a work designed for the benefit of a higher class of residents is receiving its auspicious commencement, in the establishment of a commercial school in connection with the Diocesan Board of Education, and under the immediate patronage of the distinguished Prelate who was the first to sow in this scene of moral desolation the good seed, and who now beholds the wilderness and the solitary place to be glad for them, and the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose. Without dwelling, however, on the positive good which has been thus effected, let us endeavour to form something like an estimate of the amount of evil which has been prevented. Could we from authentic documents compare the demand which this district will have made on the penal expenditure of the country, in the ten years from 1835 to 1845, with that which it has made during the ten years previous, can any one doubt that had the Church been built at the sole expense of the legislature, the money of the state would have been put out on the highest interest, and made the most profitable return? We desire, then, that instances of this description should be collected from the various Dioceses, and that petitions should be founded upon them, embodying the facts of the case; and armed with such documents, we think that the member for Oxford, fortified as he is with that indomitable perseverance which can only emanate from the consciousness of being zealously affected in a good thing, might plead his righteous cause with redoubled and resistless energy, being thus enabled to prove by facts, and beyond all human possibility of contradiction, that in communities as in individuals, the performance of their duty is in reality the protection and the

preservation of their interest ; and that, of all public expenditure, none yields, even in this life, so ample a return, as that which is consecrated to the service of Christ in the extension of His visible Church !

We conclude, therefore, with expressing our earnest hope, that Mr. Palmer's scheme for sparing the pockets of the people may be rendered nugatory and abortive, by the just and wise determination of the people, speaking by their representatives, not to spare their own. "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth ; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet ; but it tendeth to poverty."

A TREATISE ON THE RIGHT USE OF THE FATHERS
in the Decision of Controversies existing at this Day in Religion. By JOHN DAILLE, Minister of the Gospel in the Reformed Church of Paris. Translated from the French, and revised by the Rev. T. SMITH, M.A., of Christ College, Cambridge. Now re-edited and amended ; with a Preface by the Rev. G. JEKYLL, LL.B, Rector of West Coker, &c. Somerset. London: *White.* 1841.

THIS reprint of Daillé's celebrated Treatise on the Use of the Fathers is very seasonable at the present time. The reviving taste for the early writings of the Church has doubtless some advantages : but unless it be attended with sound judgment, scriptural knowledge, and the corrective which such a work as the present supplies, it must lead to serious, and perhaps even fatal errors. The tendency of the human heart to rest in what is human, and to shrink from what is divine, is so strong as to need the most watchful counteraction. The form under which this spirit now presents itself, is an undue estimate of the Fathers of the Church as our only sure guides in controversy ; and though as yet it may be only a cloud like a man's hand, it threatens to overspread shortly the whole ecclesiastical firmament. It may not be useless, then, to give a brief summary of Daillé's argument, and afterwards to offer a few remarks which naturally arise.

The Author begins by stating in his preface the grounds of difference between Romanists and Protestants, in the following words :

"All the difference in religion, which is at this day between the Church of Rome and the Protestants, lies in some certain points which the Church of Rome maintains as important and necessary articles of the Christian faith :

whereas the Protestants, on the contrary, neither believe nor will receive them for such. For as for those matters which the Protestants believe, which they conceive to be the fundamentals of religion, they are evidently and undeniably such, that even their enemies admit and receive them as well as they: inasmuch as they are both clearly delivered in the Scriptures, and expressly admitted by the ancient councils and Fathers; and are indeed unanimously received by the greatest part of Christians in all ages, and in different parts of the world. Such, for example, are the maxims, ‘That there is a God who is supreme over all, and who created the heavens and the earth:—that he created man after his own image; and that this man, revolting from his obedience, is fallen, together with his whole posterity, into most extreme and eternal misery, and become infected with sin, as with a mortal leprosy, and is therefore obnoxious to the wrath of God, and liable to his curse:—that the merciful Creator, pitying man’s estate, graciously sent his Son Jesus Christ into the world:—that his Son is God eternal with him; and that having taken flesh upon himself in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and become man, he has done and suffered in this flesh all things necessary for our salvation, having by this means sufficiently expiated for our sins by his blood; and that having finished all this, he ascended again into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; from whence he shall one day come to judge all mankind, rendering to every one according to their works:—that to enable us to communicate of this salvation by his merits, he sends us down his Holy Spirit, proceeding both from the Father and the Son, and who is also one and the same God with them; so that these three persons are notwithstanding but one God, who is blessed for ever:—that this Spirit enlightens our understanding, and generates faith in us, whereby we are justified:—that after all this, the Lord sent his Apostles to preach this doctrine of salvation throughout the whole world:—that these have planted churches, and placed in each of them pastors and teachers, whom we are to hear with all reverence, and to receive from them Baptism, the sacrament of our regeneration, and the holy Eucharist, or Lord’s Supper, which is the sacrament of our communion with Jesus Christ:—that we are likewise all of us bound fervently to love God and our neighbour; observing diligently that holy doctrine which is laid down for us in the books of the New Testament, which have been inspired by his Spirit of truth; as also those other of the Old; there being nothing, either in the one or in the other, but what is most true.

These articles, and there may be some few others of a similar nature, are the substance of the Protestant’s whole belief: and if all other Christians would but content themselves with these, there would never be any schism in the Church. But now their adversaries add to these many other points, which they press and command men to believe as necessary; and such as, without believing in, there is no possible hope of salvation. As, for example:—that the Pope of Rome is the head and supreme monarch of the whole Christian Church throughout the world:—that he, or at least the church which he acknowledges a true one, cannot possibly err in matters of faith:—that the sacrament of the Eucharist is to be adored, as being really Jesus Christ, and not a piece of bread:—that the mass is a sacrifice, that really expiates the sins of the faithful:—that Christians may and ought to have in their churches the images of God and of saints, to which, bowing down before them,—they are to use religious worship:—that it is lawful, and also very useful, to pray to saints departed and to angels:—that our souls after death, before they enter into heaven, are to pass through a certain fire, and there to endure grievous torments; thus making atonement for their sins:—that we neither may nor ought to receive the holy Eucharist, without having first confessed in private to a priest:—that none but the priest himself that consecrated the Eucharist is bound by right to receive it in both kinds:—with a great number of other opinions, which their adversaries plainly protest that they cannot with a safe conscience believe.

These points are the ground of the whole difference between them; the one

party pretending that they have been believed and received by the Church of Christ in all ages as revealed by him : and the other maintaining the contrary.

"Now, seeing that none of these tenets have any ground from any passage in the New Testament, (which is the most ancient and authentic rule of Christianity,) the maintainers are glad to fly to the writings of the doctors of the Church, which lived within the four or five first centuries after the Apostles, who are commonly called the Fathers : and my purpose in this treatise is to examine whether or not this be good and sufficient means for the decision of these differences."—(pp. xvi—xix.)

In the first book, the Author treats of the clearness of the Fathers ; in the second, of their authority.

The first difficulty in the use of the Fathers to decide present controversies, arises from the small number extant of the three first centuries nearest to the time of the Apostles, and from the nature of their works, which are simple and practical, or occupied with controversies very different from those of later times. Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius and Origen, are almost the only authors that survive, and the subjects treated by most of these are temporary and peculiar.

The third chapter dwells on the forged and supposititious writings which have been falsely assigned to the Fathers, and gathers another argument of obscurity from the difficulty of detecting them. Some remarkable facts are collected under this head, of which the two following paragraphs are specimens :—

"These forgeries are not new, and of yesterday ; but the abuse hath existed above fourteen hundred years. It is the complaint of the greatest part of the Fathers, that the heretics, to give their own dreams the greater authority, promulgated them under the names of some of the most eminent writers in the Church, and even of the Apostles themselves. Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium, who was so much esteemed by the great St. Basil, Archbishop of Cæsarea, wrote a particular tract on this subject, alleged by the Fathers of the seventh council against a certain passage produced by the Iconoclasts out of I know not what idle treatise, intituled, "The Travels of the Apostles." And I would to God that that Tract of this learned prelate were now extant ! If it were, it would perhaps do us good service in discovering the vanity of many ridiculous pieces, which now pass current in the world under the names of the primitive and most ancient Christians. S. Hierome rejecteth divers apocryphal books, which are published under the names of the Apostles, and of their first disciples ; as those of St. Peter, of Barnabas, and others. The gospel of St. Thomas, and the epistle to the Laodiceans, are classed in the same category by the seventh council.

"Now, if these knaves have thus taken such liberty with the Apostles as to make use of their names ; how much more likely is it, that they would not hesitate to make as free with the Fathers ? And indeed this kind of imposture hath always been common. Thus we read that the Nestorians sometime published an epistle under the name of St. Cyril of Alexandria, in the defence of Theodorus, Bishop of Mopsuesta, who was the author and first broacher of their heresy : and likewise that the Eutychists also circulated certain books of Apollinaris, under the title of "The Orthodox Doctors," namely, to impose on the simplicity of the people. Leontius hath written an express Tract on this subject ; wherein he shews that these men abused particularly

the names of St. Gregory of Neocæsarea, of Julius, Bishop of Rome, and of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria; and he also says particularly, that the book intituled, *Ἡ κατὰ μέρος Πίστις* (A particular Exposition of the Faith,) which is delivered unto us by Turrianus the Jesuit, Gerardus Vossius, and the last edition of Gregorius Neocæsariensis, for a true and legitimate piece of the said St. Gregory, is not truly his, but the bastard issue of the heretic Apollinaris. The like judgment do the publishers of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* give of the twelve Anathemas, which are commonly attributed to the same St. Gregory. The Monothelites also, taking the same course, forged an oration under the name of Menas, patriarch of Constantinople, and directed to Vigilius, Bishop of Rome: and two other books under the name of the same Vigilius, directed to Justinian and Theodora; wherein their heresy is in express terms delivered; and these three pieces were afterwards inserted in the body of the fifth council, and kept in the library of the Patriarch's palace in Constantinople. But this imposture was discovered and proved in the sixth council: for otherwise, who would not have been deceived by it, seeing these false pieces in so authentic a copy?"—(pp. 13—15.)

“ Others have been induced to adopt the same artifice, not out of ambition, but some other irregular fancy; as those men have done, who, having had a particular affection, either to such a person, or to such an opinion, have undertaken to write of the same, under the name of some author of good esteem and reputation with the world, to make it pass the more currently abroad: precisely as that Priest did, who published a book, entitled “The Acts of St. Paul, and of Tecla;” and being convicted of being the author of it, in the presence of St. John, he plainly confessed, that the love that he bare to St. Paul was the only cause that incited him to do it. Such was the boldness also of Ruffinus, a priest of Aquileia, (whom St. Hierome justly reprehendeth so sharply, and in so many places), who, to vindicate Origen's honour, wrote an apology for him, under the name of Pamphilus, a holy and renowned martyr; although the truth of it is, he had taken it, partly out of the first and sixth books that Eusebius had written upon the same subject, and partly made use of his own invention in it. Some similar fancy it was that moved him also to put forth the life of one Sextus, a Pythagorean philosopher, under the name of St. Sixtus the martyr, to the end that the work might be received the more favourably. What can you say to this? namely, that in the very same age there was a personage of greater note than the former; who, disliking that Hierome had translated the Old Testament out of the Hebrew, framed an epistle under his name, wherein he represents him as repenting of having done it; which epistle, even in St. Hierome's life time, though without his knowledge, was published by the said author, both at Rome and in Africa? Who could believe the truth of this bold attempt, had not St. Hierome himself related the story, and made complaint of the injury done him therein? I must impute also to a fancy of the same kind, though certainly more innocent than the other, the spreading abroad of so many predictions of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and His kingdom, under the names of the Sibyls; which was done by some of the first Christians, only to prepare the Pagans to relish this doctrine the better; as it is objected against them by Celsus in Origen. But that which is yet of greater consequence is, that even the Fathers themselves have sometimes made use of this artifice, to promote either their own opinions or their wishes. Of this we have a notable example, which was objected against the Latins by the Greeks, above two hundred years since, of two Bishops of Rome, Zozimus and Boniface; who, to authorize the title which they pretended to have, of being universal Bishops, and heads of the whole Christian Church, and particularly of the African, forged, about the beginning of the fifth century, certain canons in the council of Nice, and frequently quoted them as such in the councils in Africa; which, notwithstanding, after a long and diligent search, could never yet be found in any of the authentic copies of the said council of Nice, although the African Bishops had taken the pains to send as

far as Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, to obtain the best and most genuine copies they could. Neither indeed do the canons and acts of the council of Nice at this day, though they have since that time passed through so many various hands, contain any such thing; no, not even the editions of those very men who are the most interested in the honour of the Popes, as that of Dionysius Exiguus, who published his Latin collection of them about the year of our Saviour 525: nor any other, either ancient or modern.

As to that authentic copy of the council of Nice, which one Friar John, at the council of Florence, pretended to have been the only copy that had escaped the corruptions of the Arians, and which had for this cause been always kept under lock and key at Rome, with all the safety and care that might be, (out of which copy they had transcribed the said canons,) I confess it must needs have been kept up very close, under locks and seals, seeing that three of their Popes, namely, Zozimus, Boniface, and Celestine, could never be able to produce it for the justification of their pretended title against the African Fathers, though in a case of so great importance. And it is a strange thing to me that this man, who came a thousand years after, should now at last make use of it in this cause; whereas those very persons who had it in their custody never so much as mentioned one syllable of it; which is an evident argument that the seals of this rare book were never opened, save only in the brains of this doctor, where alone it was both framed and sealed up; brought forth and vanished all at the same instant; the greatest part of those men that have come after him being ashamed to make use of it any longer, having laid aside this chimerical invention.—(pp. 18—20.)

“We may safely then conclude, that these Popes, Zozimus and Boniface, had no other copies of the council of Nice than what we have; and also, that they did not believe that the canons of the council of Sardica were a part of the council of Nice; but that they rather purposely quoted some of the canons of Sardica, under the name of the canons of the council of Nice. And this they did, according to that maxim which was in force with those of former times, and is not entirely laid aside even in our own; that, for the advancing of a good and godly cause, it is lawful sometimes to use a little deceit, and to have recourse to what are called *pious frauds*. As they, therefore, firmly believed that the supremacy of their see over all other Churches was a business of great importance, and would be very profitable to all Christendom, we are not to wonder if, for the establishing this right to themselves, they made use of a little legerdemain, in adducing Sardica for Nice; reflecting, that if they brought their design about, this little failing of theirs would, in process of time, be abundantly repaired by the benefit and excellency of the thing itself.

“Notwithstanding the opposition made by the African Fathers against the Church of Rome, Pope Leo, not many years after, writing to the Emperor Theodosius, omitted not to make use of the old forgery, citing one of the canons of the council of Sardica for a legitimate canon of the council of Nice; which was the cause, that the Emperor Valentinian also, and his Empress Galla Placidia, writing in behalf of the said Pope Leo to the Emperor Theodosius, affirmed to him for a certain truth, that both all antiquity, and the canons of the council of Nice also, had assigned to the Pope of Rome the power of judging of points of faith, and of the prelates of the Church; Leo having before alleged that this canon of the council of Sardica was one of the canons of Nice. And thus, by a strong perseverance in this pious fraud, they have at length so fully persuaded a great part of Christendom, that the council of Nice had established this supremacy of the Pope of Rome, that it is now generally urged by all of them whenever this point is controverted.”—(pp. 22, 23.)

From forged writings, Daillé passes on to treat of corruptions in the genuine remains of antiquity. This is unhappily a still

wider subject, and occupies as much space as all that he has treated of before. For instance, “ the legates of Pope Leo, in the year 451, in the midst of the council of Chalcedon, where were assembled six hundred bishops, the very flower and choice of the whole clergy, had the confidence to quote the sixth canon of the council of Nice in these words—“ that the Church of Rome has always had the primacy ;” words which are no more found in any Greek copies of the councils, than those pretended canons of Pope Zozimus ; neither do they appear in any Greek or Latin copies, nor so much as in the edition of Dionysius Exiguus, who lived about fifty years after the council.” After many other instances of corruption in the canons of councils and other like documents, our Author proceeds :—

“ We do not here write against these men ; it is sufficient for us to give a hint only of that which is as clear as the sun , namely, that they have altered and corrupted, by their additions in some places, and curtailing in others, very many of the evidences of the ancient belief. These are they, who in this part of the 12th Epistle of St. Cyprian, written to the people of Carthage—‘ I desire that they would but patiently hear our council, &c., that our fellow-Bishops being assembled together with us, we may together examine the letters and desires of the blessed martyrs, according to the doctrine of our Lord, and in the presence of the confessors, *et secundum vestram quoque sententiam* (and according as you also shall think convenient) ’—have maliciously left out these words, *et secundum vestram quoque sententiam* : by which we may plainly understand, that these men would not by any means have us know, that the faithful people had ever anything to do with, or had any vote in the affairs of the Church. These are the same, who, in his 40th Epistle, have changed *Petram* into *Petrum* (a *Rock* into *St. Peter*) ; and who, following the steps of the ancient corruptors, have foisted into his tract, *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, wherever they thought fit, whole periods and sentences, against the faith of the best and most uncorrupted manuscripts ; as, for example, in this place :—‘ He built his Church on Him alone (St. Peter), and commanded him to feed his sheep ; ’ and in this :—‘ He established one sole chair : ’ and this other :—‘ The primacy was given to Peter, to shew that there was but one Church, and one chair of Christ ; ’ and this :—‘ Who left the chair to Peter, on which he had built his Church.’ These being additions which every one may see the object of.

“ These are the men who cannot conceal the regret they have for not having suppressed an Epistle of Firmilianus, Archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who was one of the most eminent persons of his time ; which Epistle Manutius had indeed omitted in his Roman edition of St. Cyprian,* but was afterwards inserted by Morellius in his, amongst the Epistles of St. Cyprian, to whom it was written ; and all because it informs us how the other Bishops in ancient times had dealt with the Pope. Thus we may hence observe of what temper these men have always been, and may guess how many similar pieces have been killed in the nest. Out of the like storehouse it is, that poor St. Ambrose is sent abroad, but so ill accoutred, and in so pitiful a flight, that Nicolas Faber has very much bewailed the corruption of him. For those gentlemen who have published him being over ingenious (as he saith) in another man’s works, have changed, mangled, and transposed divers things : and especially have they separated the books of the ‘ Interpellation of Job,’

* “ Atque adeo fortassis consultius foret, nunquam editam fuisse hanc epistolam ; ita ut putent, consulto illam omisisse Manutium.”—*Pamel. in arg. ep. 75. Cypri.*

and of David, which were put together in all other editions; and to do this they have, by no very commendable example, foisted in and altered divers things; and they have likewise done as much in the 'First Apology of David:' and more yet in the second, where they have erased out of the eighth chapter five or six lines, which are found in all the ancient editions of this Father. They have also attributed to this author certain tracts which are not his: as that 'Of the Forbidden Tree;' and that other, upon the last chapter of the Proverbs. We may, by the way, also take notice, that this is the edition which they followed, who printed St. Ambrose's works at Paris, anno 1643. They were such hands as these that so villainously curtailed the book 'Of the Lives of the Popes,' written by Anastasius, or rather by Damasus; leaving out, in the very entry of it, the author's epistle dedicatory, written to St. Hierome, because it did not so well suit with the present temper of Rome: omitting, in like manner, in the life of St. Peter, the passage which I shall here quote as it is found in all manuscripts:—'He consecrated St. Clement Bishop, and committed to his charge the ordering of his seat, or of the whole Church, saying, As the power of binding, and loosing, was delivered to me by my Lord Jesus Christ, in like manner do I commit to thy charge the appointing of such persons as may determine such ecclesiastical causes as may arise; that thou thyself mayest not be taken up with worldly cares, but mayest apply thy whole studies only to prayer, and preaching to the people. After he had thus disposed of his seat, he was crowned with martyrdom. This is the testament that St. Peter made; but it has been suppressed and kept from us, because in it he has charged his successors with such duties as are quite contrary both to their humour and practice. In another place, in their same book, instead of *Papa Urbis* (that is to say, 'the Pope or Bishop of the city,' namely, of Rome, as all manuscripts have it), these worthy gentlemen will needs have us read, *Papa Orbis*, that is, 'the Bishop of the whole world:' inasmuch as this is now the style of the court, and this has long since become the title of the Bishop of Rome.

"These are the men, who in Fulbertus, Bishop of Chartres (where he cites that remarkable passage of St. Augustine, 'This then is a figure commanding us to communicate of the passion of the Lord'), have inserted these words: 'Figura ergo est, dicet hæreticus:' (it is a figure then, will a heretic say:) cunningly making us believe this to be the saying of a heretic, which was indeed the true sense and meaning of St. Augustine himself, and so cited by Fulbertus. These are the very men also, who in St. Gregory have changed *exercitus sacerdotum* into *exitus sacerdotum*; reading, in the 38th Epistle of his fourth book, thus:—'All things, &c., which have been foretold, are accomplished. The king of pride (he speaks of Antichrist) is at hand; and, which is horrible to be spoken, the failing (or end) of priests is prepared: whereas the manuscripts (and it is so cited by Bellarmine too) read, An army of priests is prepared for him.'

"These are they who have made Aimonius to say, that the Fathers of the pretended eighth general council 'had ordained the adoration of images, according as had been before determined by the orthodox doctors:' whereas he wrote quite contrary, 'that they had ordained otherwise than had been formerly determined by the orthodox doct.:' as appears plainly, not only by the manuscripts, but also by the most ancient editions of this author; and even by Cardinal Baronius, quoting this passage also, in the tenth tome of his *Annals*, anno Domini 869.

"These are they who have entirely erased this following passage out of *Œcumenius*:—'For they who defended and favoured the law, introduced also the worshipping of angels; and that, because the law had been given by them. And this custom continued long in Phrygia, insomuch that the council of Laodicea made a decree, forbidding to make any addresses to angels, or to pray to them: whence also it is that we find many temples among them erected to Michael the Archangel.'

"This passage David Hoeschelius, in his notes upon the books of Origen

against Celsus, p. 483, witnesses that he himself had seen and read in his manuscripts of Œcumenius; and yet there is no such thing to be found in any of the printed copies.”—(pp. 54—58.)

The next difficulty of which our Author treats arises from the language and idioms of many of the Fathers, the change in the meaning of terms, and the “ rhetorical flourishes and logical subtleties” with which their writings abound. In this he speaks of mistranslations, whether through ignorance or design, and gathers a copious list to prove how cautious we should be in accepting second-hand authorities. We have the following pithy specimen, for instance, of Romish translations :—

“ Whosoever hath yet a mind to be further satisfied how far these men’s translations are to be trusted, let him but take the pains to compare the Greeks’ preface to Origen’s books against Celsus, with the Latin translation of *Christopherus Persona* ; and, if he please, he will do well to run over some part of the books themselves: and if he is desirous of exposing himself to the laughter of the Protestants, let him but produce, upon the honest word of this worthy interpreter, this passage out of the fifth book for the Invocation of Angels :—‘ We ought to send up our vows, and all our prayers and thanksgivings to God, by the Angel who has been set over the rest by him who is the Bishop, the living Word, and God :’ in which words he seems to intimate that Jesus Christ hath appointed some one of the angels to hear our prayers, and that by him we ought to present them to God : whereas Origen says the direct contrary; namely, ‘ That we ought to send up to God, who is above all things, all our demands, prayers, and requests, by the great High Priest, the living Word, and God, who is above all the angels :’—Πασαν μὲν γὰρ δεήσιν, καὶ πασαν προσευχὴν, καὶ ἐντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἀναπέμπτειν τῷ ἐπὶ πασὶ θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερεως, ἐμψυχου λόγου, καὶ θεοῦ.”—(pp. 72, 73)

The specimen of controversial honesty adduced in the note to the following paragraph, is also very instructive :—

“ What strange sentences and passages of authors are those that require more time and trouble in elucidating them, than in deciding the controversy itself, and which multiply differences rather than determine them; oftentimes serving as a covert and retreating place to both parties? Thus the sense and meaning of these words is debated :—‘ This is my body.’ For the explaining of them there is brought this passage out of Tertullian; and that other out of St. Augustine. Now I would have any man speak in his conscience what he thinks, whether or not these words are not as clear, or clearer, than those passages which they quote from these Fathers, as they are explained by the different parties. I desire, reader, no other judge than yourself, whosoever you are; only provided that you will but vouchsafe to read and examine that which is now said upon these places, and consider the strange turnings and contortions that they make us take, to bring us to the right sense and meaning of them. In a word, if the most able men that exist did not find themselves extremely puzzled and perplexed in distinguishing the genuine writings of the Fathers from the spurious, it is not likely that the censors of the Low Countries, who are all choice and select men, should be obliged to shew us so ill an example of finding a way to help ourselves, when the authority of the ancients is so strongly pressed against us by our adversaries, as they do, in excusing the expressions of the Fathers

sometimes, by some handsomely-contrived invention, and in putting some convenient probable sense upon them." *—(pp. 78, 79.)

A more serious evil is the rhetorical licence practised by several of the Fathers, and which, as the following instance proves, has betrayed Jerome into direct and revolting falsehood :—

"But that I may make it plainly and evidently appear how much these ornaments darken the sense of an author, I shall only here lay before you one instance, taken from St. Hierome; who, writing to Eustochium, gives her an account how he was brought before the presence of our Lord, for being too much addicted to the study of secular learning, and was there really with stripes chastised for it. 'Think not (says he) that this was any of those drowsy fancies or vain dreams which sometimes deceive us. I call to witness hereof, that tribunal before which I then lay; and that said judgment, which I was then in dread of. So may I never hereafter fall into the like danger, as this is true! I do assure you, that I found my shoulders to be all over black and blue with the stripes I then received, and which I afterwards felt when I awoke. So that I have ever since had a greater affection to the reading of divine books, than I ever before had to the study of human learning.'

"Now hearing Hierome speak thus, who would not believe this to be a true story? and who would understand this narration in the literal sense? Yet it appears plainly, from what he has elsewhere confessed, that all this was but a mere dream, and a rhetorical piece of artifice, frequently used by the masters in this art; contrived only for the better and more powerful diverting men from their too great affection to the books of the heathens. For Ruffinus, quarrelling with him on this account, and objecting against him, that, contrary to the oath which he had before taken, he did notwithstanding still apply himself to the study of Pagan learning: St. Hierome, after he had alleged many things to clear himself from this accusation, says, 'Thus you see what I could have urged for myself, had I promised any such thing waking: but now do but take notice of this new and unheard-of kind of impudence; he objects against me my very dreams!' Then presently he refers him to the words of the prophets, saying, 'We must not take heed to dreams.'"—(pp. 91, 92.)

The sixth chapter treats of the reserve practised by the Fathers, and the great impediment which it throws in the way of a just interpretation. Here too St. Jerome has the bad eminence of justifying his own practice at the expense of honesty, and the reputation of his predecessors, many of whom were comparatively free from the charge. But it became the virulent abettor of the growing superstitions to be the foremost in lowering the standard of Christian morality :—

"We have learned together (says he, writing to Pammachius), that there are divers sorts of discourse; and among the rest, that it is one thing to write *γυμναστικός* (by way of disputation), and another thing to write *διδασκαλικός* (by way of instruction). In the former of these the disputes are free and discursive; where, in answering an adversary, and proposing one time one thing, and another time another, a man argueth as he pleases; speaking one

* "Plurimos in Catholicis veteribus errores excogitato commento persæpe negamus, et commodum iis sensum affingimus, dum opponuntur in disputationibus, aut in conflictibus cum adversariis."—*Ind. Exp. Belg. in Bertr.*

thing and doing another; shewing bread (as it is in the proverb), and holding a stone in his hand. Whereas in the second kind, an open front, and, if I may so speak, ingenuousness are required. It is one thing to make inquiries, and another to define: in the one we must fight, in the other we must teach. Thou seest me in a combat, and in peril of my life; and dost thou come with thy grave instructions like some reverend schoolmaster? Do not wound me by stealth, and from whence I least expected it. Let thy sword strike directly at me: it is a shame for thee to wound thy enemy by guile, and not by strength; as if it were not a piece of the greatest mastery in fighting to threaten one part, but hit another. I beseech you read Demosthenes; read Tully: and lest perhaps you should refuse orators, whose profession it is to propose things rather probable than true, read Plato, Theophrastus, Xenophon, Aristotle, and others; who, springing all from Socrates' fountain, as so many different rivulets, ran several ways. What can you find in them that is clear and open? what word in them but hath its design? and what design, but of victory only? Origen, Methodius, Eusebius, Apollinaris, have written largely against Celsus and Porphyry. Only observe what manner of arguments, and what slippery problems, they made use of, for subverting those works which had been wrought by the spirit of the devil: and how on being sometimes forced to speak, they alleged against the Gentiles, not that which they believed, but that which was most necessary to be said. I shall not here speak anything of the Latin writers, as Tertullian, Cyprian, Minucius, Victorinus, Lactantius, and Hilary, lest I might seem rather to accuse others, than to defend myself.'"—(pp. 113, 114.)

With such maxims in force, can we wonder at the degeneracy of the church? And what judgment must we form of the wisdom of those divines, who would refer us to the Fathers of the fifth century, as clearer guides to sound doctrine than the scriptures themselves?

The following passage, in which Jerome describes the process of composition in his commentaries, will certainly tend to abate all excessive deference to their authority:—

“ St. Hierome, in his Commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians, expounds that passage, where there is mention made of St. Paul reproving St. Peter, by way of dispensation; telling us that St. Paul did not reprehend him, as if he had indeed accounted him blame-worthy; but only for the better edification, and bringing in of the Gentiles, by this seeming reprehension of his; who did but act this part with St. Peter, ‘To the end (says he) that the hypocrisy, or false shew of observing the law, which offended those among the Gentiles who had believed, might be corrected by the hypocrisy or false shew of reprehension, and that by this means both the one and the other might be saved: whilst the one, who stood up for circumcision, followed St. Peter; and those others, who refused circumcision, applaud, and are taken with St. Paul's liberty.’

“ St. Augustine, utterly disliking this exposition of St. Hierome, wrote unto him in his ordinary grave and meek way, modestly declaring the reasons why he could not assent to it; which epistles of his are yet extant. The other answers him with a thousand strange things; but particularly he there protests, that he will not warrant for sound whatever shall be found in that book of his: and to shew that he does not do this without good reason, he sets down a certain passage out of his preface to it, which is very well worth our consideration. For after he has named the writings of Origen, Didymus, Apollinaris, Theodorus, Heraclas, Eusebius, Emissenus, Alexander the heretic, and others, he adds:—‘That I may therefore plainly tell the truth, I confess that I have read all these authors; and collecting together as much

as I could in my memory, I presently called for a scribe, to whom I dictated either my own conceptions, or those of other men, without remembering either the order, or the words sometimes, or the sense?' Do but reflect now, whether or not this be not an excellent rare way of commenting upon the Scriptures, and very well worthy to be esteemed and imitated by us! He then turns his address to St. Augustine, saying, 'If therefore thou lightest upon anything in my expositions which was worthy of reprehension, it would have stood better with thy learning to have consulted the Greek authors themselves; and to have seen, whether what I have written be found in them or not; and if not, then to have condemned it as my own private opinion.'

"Hierome elsewhere gives the same answer to Ruffinus, who upbraids him for some absurd passages in his Commentaries upon the prophet Daniel.

"Now, according to this reasoning, if we would know whether or not what we meet with in Hierome's Commentaries be his own proper sense or not, we must first turn over the books of all these ancient Greeks; that is to say, we must do that which is now impossible to be done, seeing that the writings of the greatest part of them are utterly lost; and must not attribute anything to him, as his proper opinion, how clearly and expressly soever it be delivered, unless we are first able to make it appear, that it is not to be found in any of those authors, out of whose writings he has patched up his Commentaries. For if any one of them be found to have delivered anything you here meet with, you are to take notice that it belongs to that author; St. Hierome in this case having been only his transcriber, or at most but his translator. So that you may be able, perhaps, by the reading of books in this manner collected, to judge whether the Fathers have had the skill to make a clever and artificial connexion and digestion of those things which they gleaned out of so many several authors or not. Whether or not they believed all that they have set down in their books, you will be no more able to discover, than you can judge what belief any man is of by the books he transcribes; or can guess at the opinions of an interpreter by the books he translates."—(pp. 105—107.)

We certainly regard St. Jerome as one of the least trustworthy, least spiritual, and least honest of all the Fathers. But still from this extreme case we ought to gather a salutary caution against implicit reliance on the commentaries even of the others, as expressions of their own deliberate conviction.

In our summary of the rest of the work, we must be more brief. The first book contains these further propositions:—That the Fathers have often changed some of their opinions, as their judgment has been matured by study or age;—that it is necessary, but very difficult to discover how they held each opinion, whether as *probable*, or *necessary*, and *certain*;—that we ought to know what have been the opinions, not of one or two Fathers, but of the whole church;—and finally, that it is impossible to know exactly the opinions of the ancient church, universal or particular, on the particular subjects of modern controversy.

The authority of the Fathers is the subject of the second book. Its substance may be embodied in the following propositions, which are treated at length, and with much learning. First, the testimonies given by the fathers on the doctrines of the church are not always true and certain. Examples are adduced from

Jerome, John of Thessalonica, Epiphanius, and Bede, who make statements of the belief of the universal church, that are plainly erroneous. Next, they themselves bear witness that we ought not to believe them in matters of faith, upon their own bare assertion, without the testimony of scripture. Their manner of writing proves that they had no intention to be regarded as authorities, from their palpable mistakes and oversights. Of these many curious instances are given; but we prefer to pass them by in silence. Where the cause of truth and sound doctrine does not require it, we hold it better and more seemly not to parade before the public eye the weaknesses or follies of those, whom we desire, according to the measure of their real gifts of wisdom or grace, to reverence and esteem. One, however, is too instructive to be omitted. Pope Gregory II. in an epistle “rails fiercely against Uzziah for breaking the brazen serpent; and calls him, for this act, the brother of the emperor Leo the Iconoclast.” What a happy union we have here, in an infallible pope, of seditious railing, and patronage of idolatry, backed and countenanced by a disgraceful and ignorant perversion of the word of God!

In the rest of the book, Daillé proves at length, that the Fathers, even many of them together, have erred in points of doctrine; that they have often strongly contradicted each other; and that neither Romanists nor Protestants acknowledge them for judges in points of religion, but both parties reject many of their opinions. He then concludes with some just and temperate observations on the real use of the Fathers, and their actual value as witnesses to the faith of the early church.

We would now submit two or three short observations upon the general argument of this celebrated and useful work.

1. First, we think that Daillé’s reasoning is quite conclusive against every notion of the Fathers being sufficient guides to the truth, or even safe leaders to follow, without great care and discrimination in the interpretation of scripture. The word of God is divine, the Fathers, at best, are fallible men. The word of God is consistent and harmonious; the Fathers abound in contradictions. The word of God, on all the great matters of salvation, is plain and simple in its style; the writings of the Fathers clouded with mists of rhetoric, or the fumes of vehement controversy and debate. The word of God is within the reach of every Christian; the Fathers inaccessible to all but a few rich and learned men. The difficulties which are to be met with in the direct study of the scriptures, meet us with tenfold aggravation in the patristic writings. Have Christians in general to gain their knowledge of scripture through translations? It is the same with their know-

ledge of the Fathers, but the translations are far less trustworthy. Have doubts been raised by infidels and adopted by Jesuits, against the integrity of our canon, and the genuineness of the sacred writings? The proof of the authenticity of the Fathers is far more difficult. Is private judgment to be distrusted in the exposition of scripture? Surely it is far more unsafe when the field is a hundredfold wider, when the materials are uncertain and conflicting, the separate authorities fallible and often deceived, and the current of truth from the very first, as the apostle teaches, mingled with a growing mystery of corruption. No fallacy or folly seems greater, however shielded by some respectable names, than that of distrusting private judgment in the interpretation of scripture, and relying on it for a right understanding of the Fathers.

2. Since, however, the evils that flow from a rash exercise of private judgment are doubtless very great, is there no remedy to preserve the Church of Christ from their baleful effect? Undoubtedly there is, though while the Church is in the wilderness, we cannot expect the remedy itself to be faithfully applied, or that offences will cease to abound. What then is its nature? First, a deep sense of our responsibility for the right exercise of our judgment. When it is felt that salvation and knowledge of the truth are terms almost synonymous (2 Thess. ii. 10, 12, 13. 1 Tim. ii. 4.)—that both freedom, sanctification and final glory depend on this invaluable possession, (John vii. 17; viii. 32. 1 Peter i. 22. John xvii. 3.) there will be no rash or reckless exercise of a faculty, the abuse of which is so unspeakably dangerous, and its right use connected with such inestimable blessings. Next, there must be a conscientious use of all the means of knowledge in our reach. Of these, the Scriptures are the first and highest, but the writings and sentiments of holy men have also a secondary worth, and the wilful neglect of them, when put within our reach, is a token of dangerous self-confidence and a presumptuous tempting of God. Last of all, there must be a simple reliance on the promised teaching of the Holy Spirit, and continual prayer for his heavenly inspiration and guidance. These remedies are few and simple, but every Christian who is willing to use them, will find them to be effectual and complete; and all others are frivolous and vain.

3. Is there then no ground whatever of truth in the appeal so often made to the Fathers—no sense in which authority attaches to their writings? We think there is, when rightly guarded and explained. The Scriptures are the sole, perfect, and all-sufficient treasury of revealed truth. But this truth, as they teach us themselves, was designed to be successively and gradually unfolded in

the knowledge and experience of the Church of Christ. Now from this we may draw a double conclusion. First, it is a strong and almost infallible presumption against a doctrine that touches on the vitals of religion, if it be found alien from the faith, and opposed to the convictions of the best and holiest Christians in each successive age. Next, it is a powerful evidence in favour of the truth of a doctrine, if we find it to have been held by the most judicious and eminent writers of the Church, almost from the times of the Apostles themselves. We should hence gather a strong presumption that it was part of that sacred truth which it is the province of the Holy Spirit to unfold from the Scriptures to the people of Christ in every successive age.

On the other hand, there are two wide categories of doctrine, in which this subordinate test of Scriptural truth must entirely fail. The first consists of the more remote and secondary lessons of Divine faith and wisdom. For these are distributed by the Holy Spirit as special gifts to a few, or sometimes reserved for particular ages of the Church, when their help is most needful. In such cases, the non-concurrence of the Fathers may be a valid reason against overrating the importance of these secondary doctrines, but none whatever for denying their truth and reality. We should else commit the sin of chaining down the Church of Christ to a perpetual infancy of knowledge, and by miserably stinting its growth, destroy the life both of faith and holiness.

The second class of doctrines and practices in which this subordinate test must fail, is that of those which are connected with 'the mystery of iniquity,' and the downward course of internal corruption. In every subject which either Scripture or experience proves to range under this head, the Fathers cease to be authorities; they are rather beacons for our warning. They are no longer, in any sense, guide-posts in the way of truth; they are light-houses which the gracious Providence of God has kindled, to warn the Church from making shipwreck a second time, on the sunken, but fatal rocks of will-worship, superstition, idolatry, worldly ambition and spiritual pride. May we never, in these latter days, forget the impressive and fearful lesson which they read to the Church, nor grow blind once more to the mystery of iniquity, when it is ready to cast off the thin tatters of its veil, and to reveal itself in its worst and latest form, of Papal democracy, leagued with infidel anarchy and crime!

A FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS ON CHURCHES AND CHURCH ORNAMENTS. *No. I. Suited to Country Parishes. No. II. Suited to Town and Manufacturing Parishes.* Published by the Cambridge Camden Society. 1841.

THE design of these unpretending little tracts is good, and the execution for the most part highly commendable. Perhaps we ought scarcely to take upon ourselves to offer even praise, of works "*published by the Cambridge Camden Society,*" and generally attributed to its president, Archdeacon Thorp.

It may suffice to give our readers a passage or two, marked by good sense and practical knowledge:—

"But there is another reason why you should look well after your Church. It is because of the poor. If the building they meet in on the Sunday is not opened from week's end to week's end; if the walls are allowed, as is too often the case, to be covered with green mould, and the water to stand in little pools on the cold damp stones; can you wonder if they betake themselves to the next meeting-house, where they will at least be sure of being comfortably seated, rather than stay away from public worship altogether? I am not speaking of what they ought to do, but of what they will do. Is it not very sad to think of, and will it not be a sin laid to your charge, if through your neglect in not keeping the Church dry and healthy, any of your poorer brethren should take themselves away, not only from the earthly building, but from that spiritual Church of which it is a type and shadow?"

"The great cause of almost all the ruin and unhealthiness that are found in our Parish Churches may be told in one word, DAMP. And, as matters commonly stand, how can it be otherwise? In the first place there is a mass of wet soil always rotting in the churchyard: this is mostly heaped up to some height against the walls: the mound so raised every week becomes higher by sweepings from the Church, pieces of old matting, and all the odds and ends that the sexton carries out on the Monday morning: and on this pile, damp and decaying of itself, the eaves of the roof are every now and then discharging fresh water, and the sun can shine but little upon it. Our forefathers made their foundations very strong; but it is not in stone and cement to stand for ever against wet, and above all wet earth. It follows of course that the outside walls crumble away by degrees, and in the inside long tracks of green slime shew themselves one after another. If they make any one's seat uncomfortable, and it is agreed to get rid of them, there are two ways used for this purpose. The one is, to board over the piece of wall so diseased; and thus the wall, being now shut out from the drying of the air, cracks all the quicker. The other is to whitewash the place: and when the mould comes again, to whitewash it again, and so on; unless sometimes by way of change lamp-black is used instead. But you may try these plans for ever without getting rid of the enemy you want to destroy. Your plan must be rather more troublesome, but it will be both sure and speedy. You must begin by clearing away all the earth from the walls of the Church, about three or four feet broad. If unhappily any graves have been made close to the wall, they must be moved further back. This advice may seem at first hard-hearted; but it is not so. To leave them where they are is cruelty to the living: and you will not, I think, suspect me of wantonly disturbing the remains of the dead. You will next have to make a gutter of drain-tiles all round the building, and carry it off at a slope from the churchyard. I need not remind you that, unless your eave-drains and water-spouts are good, and

so contrived that all their water may run into the drain-tiles, your pains will have been altogether in vain. When you have done this, however green the inside walls may have been, in a very short time you will find that they are beginning to dry : and you may drive away the stains all the faster by mixing equal quantities of water and sulphuric acid, or (which you will get still cheaper at any chemist's) corrosive sublimate, and mopping the wall lightly with the mixture.

"You will find the following plan also very useful in making the Church drier. The door and some of the windows should be left open for a thorough draught during the whole day, and in all weathers : to prevent mischief, there should be wire over the open windows, and a lattice door, which may be kept locked ; and which should exactly fit the whole opening, to hinder birds from getting in."—(pp. 6, 7.)

We may doubt the wisdom of the first ten words of the following ; but of the truth and importance of the remainder there can be no question :—

"The more you encourage ringing, I mean good ringing, the better ; but I hope you will never let the bells be rung at an election, or any thing of that kind. The church is in all countries what it is called in some, The House of Peace ; do not make any dislike the sound of its sweet bells, by hearing them rung because their own side is beaten ; no, not even though they should be wrong and you right. And therefore a flag on a church-tower during a contested election is what ought never to be seen."—(p. 13.)

All this is solid and useful counsel, and there is much of the same description. But we confess that our main reason for naming these unpretending and popular little tracts, arose from our regretfully perceiving in them, though dated from "Cambridge," too many traces of that superstitious feeling which has recently spread itself, mainly from the sister University. For instance, it is well and rightly said of the churchyard—

"You should not allow children or idle people to play there, defacing the grave-stones,"

but why add ?

"and learning to think lightly of hallowed places, where, if an angel were to meet us, he would say, '*Take off thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.*'"

This supposition,—or rather assertion, for it is unhesitatingly declared as a matter of certainty,—is wholly unwarranted, either by Scripture or common sense. The consecration of churchyards, however seemly and proper, is a mere human invention, and no man has a right to say that angels must look with awe upon a spot of ground, merely because a few human beings, without any divine command, have chosen to read a certain service over it !

But what will our readers think of such fancies as these ?

"Indeed all pews must more or less hide the Altar, even where a middle passage is left leading to it. But men are beginning to fill even this passage with pews, which are the more valuable as having so good a view of the

preacher. I have told you that the several parts of a church have generally a symbolical meaning, just as the Jewish Tabernacle was figurative and typical. Now if the open passage from the door to the Altar typifies the whole Christian course and the straight way to Heaven, when that passage is so blocked up it seems to mean that this passage is now closed. Do not let such a blot as this remain in your Church. Indeed pews have nearly made us quite forget the meaning of the parts of a church. Thus, because there is mostly a passage left between the rows of pews up the Nave and each of the Aisles, people think no more of the Nave and the Aisles themselves, (in which they might find an emblem of the MOST HOLY TRINITY,) but only of these passages within them, which they call the 'middle aisle' and 'side aisles.'"
—(p. 8.)

"There is a good reason why the doors of the Church should all be towards the west end, (excepting one in the Chancel for the Priest alone :) to bear their part in the general symbolism of the building. For, as the Altar stands at the east end of the Chancel, representing the full Communion of the Christian, and the end of the Christian life in Heaven, so the entrance ought to be at or towards the west end of the Nave, *and the Font by it*, to show that thus the entrance into the earthly building typifies our initiation by Holy Baptism into the spiritual Church."—(p. 9.)

"But why need I speak of what used to be over the Chancel-arch, when that arch itself is so shamefully maltreated? Besides the deep meaning to be found in its position between the Chancel and the Nave, typifying the faithful death of the Christian, as the soul passes the barrier between Earth and Heaven, it is often one of the most beautiful ornaments of the church."
—(p. 20.)

Here again we have the old superstitions. The term "altar," so carefully weeded out at the Reformation, is again introduced. Yet this is one of the points on which there is no question as to the mind of the framers of our Liturgy. We quote from a well-known work the following facts:—

"Strype narrates, that in settling externals, as well as doctrinal points, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, the question of 'tables' or 'altars' required to be decided. And Bishops Cox, Sandys, and Grindal, and probably Archbishop Parker, drew up and published, authoritatively, 'Reasons why it was not convenient, that the communion should be administered at an Altar.' And among these 'reasons,' we find the following:—

"'1. The form of a table is most agreeable to Christ's example, who instituted the sacrament of his body and blood at a table, and not at an altar.' * *

"'3. The Holy Ghost in the New Testament, speaking of the Lord's Supper, doth make mention of a table (1 Cor. x.), but in no place nameth it an altar.'

"'4. The old writers do use also the name of a table: (as Augustine, Chrysostom, &c.) And although the same writers do sometimes term it an altar, yet are they to be expounded to speak *abusive et improprie*.'

"'Furthermore, an altar hath relation to a sacrifice, for they be

correlative. So that, of necessity, if we allow an *altar*, we must grant a *sacrifice*.'

"And, accordingly, as the idea of admitting a *sacrifice* was altogether abhorrent to their minds, orders were given for the immediate taking down of all the altars."

Now, if we would only cordially fall in with this plain decision and intention of our Church, and speak, as she always does, of the communion "table," all the accompanying circumstances would at once be rectified. We should no longer be so anxious about the situation of the table,—whether it stood at the east end of the church, or at the west;—we should no longer be so earnest that "nothing should intercept the view of the *altar*." We should no longer be so punctilious in facing to the *east*; bowing to the *east*; and other "bodily exercises" which "profit little;" but rather belong to that "will-worship" against which the apostle cautioned his hearers.

This fancy, of late years dying away, but now anew revived,—of an imaginary necessity, an obligation to build our churches in such wise as that the altar shall be at the eastern end, is so extremely inconvenient that nothing but some clear and indisputable warrant could render it admissible. For some time past it has been abandoned; and the attempt to revive it is quite lamentable.

In London, and in many other of our larger towns, the streets generally run east and west, or north and south. Obviously, therefore, it is just *thrice* as probable that the site which offers itself for a new church, should have its front to the east, or the north, or the south,—as that it should face the west. In the former cases, what is to be done?

The operation of this difficulty is seen in two churches built within the last twenty years, in Regent Street. Both of them are on the western side of the street, and face the *east*. And being built in the midst of houses, the front, or street, is the only side on which they are accessible.

With one, St. Philip's, the course suggested by common sense has been taken. The main entrance is at the east end; it opens at once into the body of the Church, and at the opposite extremity appears the Communion Table, fitly and conveniently placed at the *western* end of the building.

In the other case, all manner of absurdities are committed. The entrance could only be from the east; and the planners of the building seem to have imagined that the "altar" could only stand in the east also. Hence the back of the "altar-piece" is erected immediately before the main entrance. The congregation walk straight in, behind this altar-piece, and then have to steal round,

to the right or left, and find their way in by the two small doors placed on each side of the "altar." Hence, too, arises another difficulty. The font, it was supposed, must stand near the entrance. Well, but the "altar" stood just across the entrance; hence the two, "altar" and font, were necessarily brought together; and, accordingly, the font is placed within the rails of the Communion Table, *standing immediately before the "altar!"*

In one particular case, especially alluded to in the Tracts before us, the Communion Table is placed in the *northern* recess; but we beg to inform the Archdeacon, that before this was done, the mind of the Bishop was taken on the subject, and his Lordship declared the position to be a matter of indifference.

We observe, also, that in the new Church of St. Luke in Berwick-street, erected under the Bishop's own eye, in the parish in which he resides, the table is placed at the *southern* end. In George's, Bloomsbury, it stands at the north end; in All Souls', Langham-place, and in Trinity Church, St. Brides, in the north-east. A variety of other and similar departures might easily be particularized.

The great question, however, is, or ought to be, What principle, or authority, is involved in this question? Wherefore is it that any persons suppose that the table *ought to be* at the east, or that the entrance of the Church *ought to be* from the west?

Merely to allege, as the writer of these tracts does, that "all old churches are so arranged," is a reason which, if it were admitted to be a valid one, would conduct us back to the mummeries and idol-worship of the middle ages. If there be no religious or moral reason for insisting upon a particular aspect for a Church, the *mere* fact that the monks used so to build, will stand us in little stead.

We do not remember to have heard any other attempt at a reason, except the common one, of praying towards, or bowing towards, the holy land. But if we are to have a geographical reason, let it be a reasonable and *true* one. It might suffice for the age of the Crusades, to be told that Jerusalem lay "*towards the east:*" but even our charity-school children are now taught, that when they turn towards the east, their faces are towards Astracan, not towards Jerusalem.

And if, too, *this* is to be the reason to be assigned, we have next to ask, how does this notion operate in other parts of the globe? Our new cathedral at Calcutta,—what is to be its position? *Its* "altar," clearly, cannot be placed at the eastern end, *in order* to direct men's minds and eyes towards the Holy Land. The same question may be asked of our Australian Churches, and of those

in Southern Africa. In truth the whole superstition is encumbered with difficulties; and the only way of escape is that of getting out of darkness into light, and abandoning the devices of the middle ages for the solid substance and simplicity of the gospel.

TVBA CONCORDIAE; or a Letter to the future Prime Minister relative to the Pacification of Ireland and the Condition of the Church. By the Rev. FRANCIS DIEDRICH WACKERBARTH, A.B., of Queen's Col. Cam. Priest of the Anglican Church, and Hon. Cor. Memb. of the College of Civil Engineers. Lichfield: *Lomax*. 1841.

SUCH is the title-page of a little tract of eight pages, which, after enquiring in vain at Rivingtons' and other shops, we obtained at Mr. Dolman's, the Romanist bookseller in Bond-street. It seems sufficiently clear that it is a production with which none but a Romanist publisher feels disposed to have to do. We are not about to review it,—our duty will be better discharged by giving it entire, without a word of comment.

“SIR,—Called as you now are soon to be, to direct the destinies of this great empire, the state of Ireland will necessarily be a subject that will claim early and serious attention at your hands. I consider it therefore my duty, both as an Englishman and a priest of the English Church, to submit to your careful consideration a measure, which, I cannot but feel persuaded, would at least go far, under God's blessing, towards terminating the ceaseless jarrings and wretched heart-burnings relative to and within that important section of the empire, which have so long continued and still continue to involve all the counsels of this nation in the darkest and most hopeless perplexity. That Ireland has been hitherto eternally in a state more or less identical with rebellion, is a phenomenon which cannot have escaped the eyes of any individual living, and is in fact acknowledged by every one. And such a phenomenon must have a cause, and when this cause is once clearly understood, it appears to me very possible (and if so, surely a positive duty incumbent upon us) both to remove this cause, and to attach Ireland to the English nation by bonds holier and firmer than any that acts of parliament can fabricate. Ireland is not only a most important portion of the British dominions, not

only a beautiful and fertile country, but what is more, the Irish people are our brethren, men with warm and faithful hearts, who can and will love and attach themselves firmly and devotedly to those who will do them justice; and Ireland therefore might be made, and ought to be made, one of the brightest jewels of the English crown, a happy and contented people, crowned with the blessings of sound and undivided faith, of plenty and of peace. Instead of any such condition being the fate of unhappy Ireland, that fine country has, for centuries past, presented nothing but one unvaried picture of turmoil, division and disturbance.

“That these disturbances arise mainly from religious divisions, is a proposition which will, I conceive, be very generally admitted. It becomes us then to look at the condition of the Church, i. e. as regards the conduct she has met with at the hands of the State. And when this is considered, I fearlessly affirm that justice has not been done to Ireland—no, nor to England—nor, what is more, to God. And yet if peace is to be obtained, justice must be done to all. Let us look the facts of this business fairly in the face. We have at present, in Britain, two branches of the Church Catholic, kept divided by the authority of the State, viz. the Anglican, ‘established’ (i. e. subjugated) ‘by the Law,’ and the Roman, persecuted by the Law: and what is it else than the oppression and tyranny of the State, which for three centuries has been grinding down the one as a bondsman, and harrying the other as an enemy, that keeps these two branches from uniting under the shadow of the perennial rock, I own I am greatly to seek. In doctrine (as Mr. Newman, Mr. Oakley, Mr. Ward, the British Critic and others, have abundantly shewn) there is absolutely no difference * between them. Both maintain the same faith, both administer the same sacraments, both acknowledge the same Spiritual Vicar of the universal Lord, both teach the same principles of loyalty and civil obedience, and one is even the daughter of the other. Yet in spite of their holy and pacific principles, the State has treated both with the most bitter and implacable enmity;—and in spite of their similitude and relationship, has persecuted them in opposite ways. While it has sought to exter-

* “Nothing can, in my opinion, be more ill-timed and ill-judged than the attempts made by many persons, to make out and multiply points of difference. This is most especially distressing in men of piety and learning, like Mr. Palmer, of Worcester College, who has addressed to the very learned and excellent Bishop of Melipotamus, (a prelate whose attainments both in Christian scholarship and Christian holiness, must place his character, in the eyes of those who have the privilege of knowing him, too high for the reach of detraction,) certain letters, which, both for tone and for substance, appear to me deserving of very strong reprobation. In letter 5, pp. 71, 72, are in my opinion little, if at all, short of heresy, and I would wish readers to turn out the quotation p. 60, from Hilary the Deacon, and observe of whom the words of the Father are spoken, and to what they apply.”

minate the mother by racks and gibbets, and knives ; by confiscations, by plunderings, and all the terrors of merciless enactments and savage laws, the daughter has been visited with chains and cruel bondage, with impropriation, appropriation, and præmunire, with usurpation, extortion and oppression. The appointment of her rulers has been torn from her, and strange governors have been set over her by the secular tyrants of the day, and this too often to serve the worst of purposes, and by the usurpation of nearly all her patronage, not only has her learned character been miserably degraded, but the foul leaven of Protestantism has been made to tinge the language of her accredited documents, so as practically to have seriously corrupted the doctrine and discipline of her members. And this is most palpably evident in the Irish branch, where the inundating of the clerical profession with maintainers of the Orange rebellion, has almost reduced the Anglican Church to the level of a Protestant sect.

“ Now, I lay it down as a positive duty incumbent on the State, to cease this opposition to the union of the faithful in one, according to the express command of our Saviour. The King of Kings and Lord of Lords has enjoined unity on his followers, nay, has made it the distinctive mark whereby they are to be known, and I therefore go farther, and lay it down as a duty incumbent on the State, under the severest penalties of Almighty God’s wrath and curse in case of disobedience, instead of opposing, to promote such union. And how, I ask, can a State call itself Christian, while it usurps the rights and privileges of CHRIST’S Vicar, and violently restrains its subjects from rallying, in obedience to God’s law, round His appointed centre of unity ? By what right does the State interfere to make acts of parliament supersede the everlasting Gospel ? I maintain that the acts of parliament which stand in the way of our re-union with Rome are high treason against God, and must be henceforth blotted from the Statute-book. I maintain that these acts unchristianize the State, and entail schism on the nation, and in the name of the souls of the people, I demand their immediate repeal.

“ I am aware that it will be said that statesmen have hitherto been deterred from attempting the measure of Unity, so necessary and salutary to this nation, by fear of the Orange faction. Now, to say nothing of the baseness that would prefer place and pension to failing in a noble attempt and consequent resignation, I must remark that this excuse will be no longer valid. The present House of Commons is such that I doubt not I am addressing a Conservative Premier, and I speak therefore as a Tory of the original school of 1688 ; and I beg, Sir, to remind you, that the

present election enables you to dispense with the aid of the Orange faction, for their defection would be quite or nearly covered by the accession of the Roman Catholic members, whose support you would of course have, were you to introduce such measures as would tend to restore Unity to the Catholic Church. Nothing therefore stands in the way of your taking such a course as may enable us to return to the embrace of our Holy and Apostolic Mother ; for the long pampered Orange party is but as a fatted calf, ready for sacrifice, to celebrate the return of the prodigal, and this would assuredly be an effective peace-offering for Ireland. It is vain to put Ireland under martial law, or to attempt to quell her spirit by penal enactments. The spirit of man was never crushed by violence, and I trust never may be,—the cords of the heart and soul, the genuine, touching, and persuasive movings of the Church are the only principles of government which can ever be effective and permanent. This truth is more than abundantly demonstrated by the utter failure of three centuries' trial to govern people by gibbets and bayonets, rather than by the gentle influences of the Christian religion. It is moral and not mere physical force that is necessary for the pacification of Ireland, and a moral power competent to this purpose may be obtained by the *union of the Churches, and by no other process*; and if this is not effected, Ireland will most undoubtedly be severed from the British Crown, a catastrophe, which, Sir, I suppose you can hardly desire. But a union of the Anglican Church with the Centre of Unity, might with but little difficulty be accomplished. Let those hateful enactments, which prevent the Anglican Bishops from entertaining such a scheme, be repealed, and let the Bishops of both branches of the Church be requested to meet and concert measures for bringing about so glorious a consummation, and I feel persuaded that terms, and easy terms too, for a complete re-union of the Churches of this kingdom, under the Holy See, would very shortly be agreed upon. And I am moreover morally sure that however the State may choose to harry and oppress, it cannot long keep the English Church from the arms of our loved but long-lost mother. But, Sir, if you are prepared to lead the State to doing what is its positive duty, a re-union may easily be accomplished, whereby a great, mischievous, and very sinful schism would be abolished, and Ireland effectually pacified and permanently united to England.

“ I remain, Sir, your obedient Servant,

“ FRANCIS DIEDRICH WACKERBARTH.”

Such is Mr. Wackerbarth's proposition. If asked what is our opinion of it, and of its author, we reply that we are not disposed

to attach much importance to either ; save as an indication of the lengths to which Oxford-tract doctrine is carried, and will be carried, by the junior and less subtle of its adherents. Mr. Wackerbarth himself we take to be one of those weak young men whose prevailing folly is, a passion for notoriety. Some such there always will be ; who are ever ready to rush into the front rank, and to aim at attracting attention by their bravados and gesticulations. We build little, therefore, upon this circumstance ; nor should we have noticed it at all, except to shew, by the evidence of a zealous tractarian, what the natural result must be, of proving the thirty-nine articles and the decrees of Trent, to be consistent with each other. If it were possible for this position to be established by any legitimate course of reasoning, the fair inference would be, either that the Church of England is already involved in the guilt of the Romish apostacy, and needs immediate reform ; or that her separation from Rome is indefensible, and ought instantly to be abandoned.

It is not from such frank and plain-spoken declarations of adherence to popery, that we apprehend much danger. Far more insidious and more perilous are such reasonings as the following, which we extract from a periodical of the last month ; which periodical regrets Mr. Wackerbarth's tract, as an "*indiscreet ebullition.*" In censuring in the strongest terms, a tract entitled "*The Old Oak Tree,*" which has recently been published by *the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, the following language is used :—

"We charge the writer with a gross misuse of doctrinal terms. "At page 20, our lay preacher informs us that 'his son was permitted to be the instrument of his *conversion*,' Alas ! where is the spirit of Nelson and Bray, and other founders of the Society, departed ! Surely the Church has not encouraged the modern habit of dating conversion, of taking cognizance of any marked revolutionary epoch in a man's life, besides his baptism. That, considering how many wander from baptismal standing and privilege, there may be such epochs graciously vouchsafed and blessed, none will deny ; but it is not safe to speak of them as part of the divine plan, or in the ordinary course of spiritual history.

"Another doctrinal fault is equally notorious. It appears, either that this writer is ignorant that there has ever been a controversy on the meaning of justification, or else that he deliberately adopts that interpretation of the doctrine which is opposed to the Church's teaching. To 'justify,' no doubt, means to acquit, just as to 'convert' means to turn, and *à priori*, there would be no reason why they should not both be used in the widest possible signification. But seeing that the

" Church has long since appropriated one of them, at least, to a
 " peculiar significance, (making it, as we should say in logic, a
 " word 'secundæ intentionis,') any departure from this authorita-
 " tive decision is not only to be deprecated, but becomes a mark
 " of heresy. Now, justification in Anglican theology is ruled to
 " be the first step in the Christian life. In the thirteenth article,
 " 'works done before justification' are explained to be equivalent
 " to 'works done before the grace of Christ and inspiration of his
 " 'Spirit;' which, *at the latest*, takes place at baptism; just as
 " St. Paul says, '*being* justified (he uses the past participle) by
 " 'faith, we have peace with God through Jesus Christ; by whom
 " 'also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand;'
 " and what should we say, then, of a prayer offered up for a whole
 " parish of baptized Christians, that God, 'in his own good time,
 " '*would* bring them to himself, and *justify* them by the blood of
 " 'his Son?' (p. 127.) But it is impossible, after all, to show by
 " single extracts the entire contrariety of this tract to the teaching
 " of the Church. The whole tone and spirit of it is sectarian: and
 " we protest against its being allowed to continue longer on the
 " list of the Society. Let the Committee see to it. It is to poi-
 " son the fountains." *

The first thing to be remarked in this passage, is,—the cool
 assurance with which the doctrine of Mr. Newman is *taken for*
granted to be the doctrine of the Church of England. To doubt
 it, is nothing else than clear, indubitable HERESY. We will repeat
 the writer's words:—

" Any departure from this *authoritative decision* (of the Church)
 " is not only to be deprecated, but *becomes a mark of heresy.*"

" Justification, in Anglican theology, is *ruled* to be the first step
 " in the Christian life."

" In the thirteenth article, 'works done before justification' are
 " explained to be equivalent to 'works done before the grace of
 " 'Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit;' WHICH, *at the latest*,
 " *takes place at baptism.*"

Thus, in the twinkling of an eye, is it *proved*, (!) that the
 Church declares that every baptized person is a justified person;
 and that to doubt this is positive "*heresy!*"

But cannot this exceedingly flippant person see that syllogisms
 of this sort may be coined by any person, and to prove any
 doctrine. In the space of five or six lines he proves, to his own
 satisfaction, by a word in the prefix to the thirteenth article, that
 the Church holds that every baptized person is justified. The

* *Christian Remembrancer*, October, 1841, p. 273.

next man may catch at a similar expression in the eleventh article, and carry the argument one step further:—as thus,

“The Church has ruled that ‘justification’ is equivalent with ‘salvation,’—calling a Homily, indifferently, by one term as identical with the other.

“Every baptized person, consequently, is saved. Baptism is justification, and justification is salvation.”

What more comfortable or convenient doctrine would the rank-est Antinomian in Christendom require? But what can be more directly opposed to the constant tenor of God’s word;—“Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations?” (Jer. vii. 9, 10.)

But this matter cannot be lightly dismissed. It is of far higher importance than the dreamings of the Wackerbarths or the Pagets. Whether we shall call the table an “altar,” or not; whether we shall set up two candles on it, or not; whether we shall acknowledge the precedency of the Bishop of Rome or not,—with an hundred similar questions, all sink into insignificance, when compared with this,—*the main point at which Satan is aiming*,—the putting an entire end to the preaching of “*Repentance toward God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.*”

We say that this is the clear and obvious drift of the above passage. Two vehement protests are lodged against doctrines set forth in a publication of the *Christian Knowledge Society*;—the first, that *conversion* is to be looked for, or desired, in the case of baptized persons; the second, that *justification* is to be sought by those who have received the initiatory sacrament. Both these notions are declared to be heretical. No marked epoch, or change, is to be looked for, in any man’s spiritual history, subsequently to his baptism; for in baptism he *has been* justified, and hence “*has peace with God.*” Say we not truly, then, that to the baptized,—i.e. to the great mass of hearers, this writer would hold it to be utterly wrong to preach “*Repentance toward God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ?*”

Yet in such preaching is the only hope of the Church, and of the world. Hence is it Satan’s main desire, by ANY means, whether by the instrumentality of the pious or the impious; whether by the profane or by the “devout and honourable,” (Acts xiii. 50.) to stop this preaching of the cross of Christ. Probably the Church has never seen a more subtle device of the Evil One, than this which is now in operation. To make much of “faith,”

of "justification," of "conversion,"—but at the same time to persuade men, *whatever may be their state of heart*,—that they are *already in possession* of all these spiritual blessings,—that in baptism those privileges were all bestowed, and are not to be again obtained,—has there ever been tried, since the days of Eve, a more artful method of quieting men's consciences?

We will meet the whole fallacy, without fear, on the writer's own favorite ground,—the "authoritative decisions" of the Church; but we shall first appeal to a yet higher authority, that of the only infallible rule, the word of God. Let us go first to Scripture, and then to the Church of England,—to learn what is the teaching of each, on this great question of justification and conversion.

The uniform and unequivocal declarations of Scripture, as to the state of *all mankind*, are too numerous and too distinct to be evaded. "What is man, that he should be clean? and he which
" is born of a woman, that he should be righteous? Behold, He
" putteth no trust in his saints; yea, the heavens are not clean in
" his sight. How much more abominable and filthy is man, which
" drinketh iniquity like water." (Job xv. 14—16.) "All have
" sinned, and come short of the glory of God." (Rom. iii. 23.)
" I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing:
" for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is
" good I find not." (Rom. vii. 18.) "The natural man receiveth
" not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto
" him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually
" discerned." (1 Cor. ii. 14.)

A vast and mighty change, then, is absolutely necessary in every human being, in order to his being saved. And how is that change to be effected? Equally clear is the word of truth on this point.

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he
" that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of
" God abideth on him." (John iii. 36,) "Being justified by faith,
" we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. By
" whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we
" stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom. v. 1, 2.)
"Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your
" souls." (1 Pet. i. 9.) "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the
" Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat,
" loveth him also that is begotten of him. By this we know that
" we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his
" commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his
" commandments: and his commandments are not grievous. For
" whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the

“victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” (1 John v. 1—4.)

All this the writer before us will profess to admit, inasmuch as we have produced nothing but the plain word of God, which perpetually describes this change as being not trivial or nominal, but altogether stupendous in its nature and effects. It is “a passing from death unto life;” a “deliverance from the power of darkness, and translation into the kingdom of God’s dear Son.” But their reply is, that all this took place at baptism;—that “the Church knows no marked epoch in a man’s life, besides his baptism;”—and that it is of baptism that St. Paul speaks when he says, “*being* justified by faith we have peace with God through Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand.” Thus baptism is the alpha and omega of salvation; and to speak of justification and conversion as blessings *still* to be desired, for any who have received baptism, is nothing short of positive “heresy.”

It is against such unfounded and most perilous assumptions as these, that the argument of St. James is directed. “*Being justified by faith,*” says St. Paul, “*we have peace with God.*” “Just so,” says the writer before us,—“having been justified, by faith, *in baptism*, we are now at peace with God, and questions about conversion and the like do not apply to us.”

“But what doth it profit,” replies St. James, “though a man *say* he hath faith, and have not works; can faith,”—a dead faith, or faith without works, can such a faith “save him?” “And wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead. Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect.” (Ch. ii. 21, 22.) “Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.” (v. 24.)

Endless are the devices of the human heart; and Satan cares not whether the man is deluding himself with a vain reliance on his own works, or an equally vain reliance on a faith without works—a dead or merely nominal faith. Either course fully answers the Tempter’s purpose, of keeping men from coming to Christ, “that they might have life.”

Not St. James only, however, but the whole New Testament, the whole Bible, is opposed to this monstrous assumption—that men living in sin and in forgetfulness of God, are to be dealt with as persons *already* justified, *already* converted, inasmuch as they have been already baptized.

“Without faith it is impossible to please God.” “He that

“ believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he
 “ that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believ-
 “ eth not the record that God gave of his Son.” “ He that hath
 “ the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath
 “ not life.” (1 John v. 10.)

It is replied, “ We have faith; we are justified by faith; for we
 “ have been baptized.”

All scripture, however, rejoins, “ *The tree is known by its
 “ fruits.*” Simon was baptized, and yet it was not long before
 Peter discerned that his heart was “ *not right in the sight of
 “ God;*” that he had neither part nor lot in the matter; but
 “ *was in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity.*”

Before, therefore, we can admit the possession of faith by any
 one, we must ask for those fruits which are prescribed in God’s
 word, as indispensable accompaniments of that grace. “ In Christ
 “ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision,
 “ but faith *which worketh by love.*” (Gal. v. 6.) “ Every man that
 “ hath this hope in him *purifieth himself*, even as He is pure.”
 (1 John iii. 3.) “ If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, *he is
 “ none of his.*” (Rom. viii. 9.) “ The fruit of the Spirit is love,
 “ joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness,
 “ temperance.” (Gal. v. 22, 24.) “ The fruit of the Spirit is in
 “ all goodness, and righteousness, and truth.” (Eph. v. 9.) “ There
 “ is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ
 “ Jesus, *who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.*” (Rom.
 viii. 1.) “ Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us
 “ from all iniquity, and purify unto himself *a peculiar people,
 “ zealous of good works.*” (Titus ii. 14.) “ Whatsoever is born
 “ of God *overcometh the world*, and this is the victory that over-
 “ cometh the world, even our faith.” (1 John v. 4.)

Let us now return to the writer before us. That we are not
 mistaking or misrepresenting him, is clear from his question,
 “ What should we say then, of a prayer offered up for a whole
 “ parish of baptized Christians, that God ‘in his own good time,’
 “ *would* bring them to Himself, and *justify* them by the blood of his
 “ Son?” By the question we learn that the writer deems such a
 prayer most heretical. The parish consisted of “baptized Chris-
 tians,” the people, therefore, were not to be taught that they
 needed to be brought to God, or that justification was still to be
 desired or prayed for.

Here lies the gist of the whole question. There is no parish
 which we have ever yet seen, in which the bulk of the people are
 not “far from God,” “serving divers lusts and pleasures; living
 “in malice and envy; hateful, and hating one another.” Doubt-

less, in most parts of England the larger number are "baptized Christians;"—i.e. Christians, so far as baptism can make them so. But, as for *their own* value for the sacraments, what can be said of two parishes we might point out, within two miles of each other, the one having a population of 12,000, the other of 20,000,—in each of which the Lord's supper is administered, monthly, to about *fifty* persons?

In these, and in a multitude of similar cases, the majority of the people are Sabbath-breakers, living, to open observance, "without God in the world." Yet, according to this writer, having been baptized, they have all a right to say, with St. Paul, "*being justified* by faith, we have peace with God."!!

An obvious question immediately presents itself. Multitudes of these poor creatures, "baptized Christians," are perpetually dropping into the grave. Some die of one vice, some of another. Many perish *in* drunkenness; many, from the commission of lewdness; but the great majority, it is to be feared, without any real "calling upon God." Dying in sin, unrepented, unforsaken sin, can they be saved? Yet, on the other hand, if they are "justified by faith," can they perish?

Of the answer to this latter question, there cannot be a moment's doubt. "*Whom He justified, them He also glorified.*" (Rom. viii. 30.) "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, *hath* everlasting life, and *shall not* come into condemnation." (John v. 24.)

No, it is not a matter on which a moment's doubt can rest. No justified sinner shall ever have his lot with "the unbelieving," "in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, *shall never thirst*; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water, springing up into *everlasting life.*" (John iv. 14.) No one, once justified by faith in Christ, shall "come into condemnation." A justified sinner must infallibly be saved. But thousands of baptized sinners die blaspheming; and of their salvation we can entertain no hope. Hence it is impossible to imagine that baptism and justification are identical, or that they are indissolubly connected. Baptized persons are not thereby justified; baptized persons do not commonly receive that "new heart" which is essential to salvation; baptized persons do not,—all mankind being judges of the fact,—ordinarily shew any signs of the fruits or graces of the Spirit;—hence it is right, and lawful, and necessary, to call upon such, when living "without God in the world," as nine-tenths of all "baptized Christians" do,—to "repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance."

It is right to teach them to seek for justification by faith, and conversion to God, as blessings with which they are, as yet, totally unacquainted.

Thus much of the teaching of God's word on this point, We will next turn to the instructions of the Church of England, confident that we shall find no discrepancy between the two.

But the difficulty here will be, that as the Church *expounds* Scripture, the extent of her instructions will preclude our giving them at length. We must be content to refer to and describe them, in the hope that our readers will study them for themselves.

The question we are discussing is this:—It is objected against the writer of a recent work—1. That he speaks of a man's *conversion* as an event occurring in the course of his life; whereas, in the censor's opinion, no other epoch of that kind ought to be spoken of than baptism, which ordinarily takes place in infancy: 2. Justification is also referred to, as a grace granted in after life; whereas the censor objects, that this takes place at baptism also. The scheme of doctrine laid down by the critic seems to assert that all baptised persons are justified, converted, and filled with the Holy Spirit at baptism; and that all exhortations addressed to them in youth and manhood ought to aim at nothing more than their preservation in "baptismal standing and privilege."

Any one who is at all acquainted with the authorized teaching of the Church of England, in her Book of Homilies,—will know that this is not merely *not* the plan adopted in that course of instruction, but that it is *entirely contrary to it*.

The writer before us would begin by assuring and reminding all "baptized Christians," i.e. the bulk of his hearers, of their blessed standing and privileges. The authors of the Book of Homilies take the very different course of commencing their instruction with two sermons *on the Misery of Man*.

The writer before us would next branch into the great question of justification, and would congratulate his hearers that they had *already* been justified in their baptism.

Archbishop Cranmer, however, in his *Homily on Salvation*, takes a totally different view; and, though addressing "baptized Christians," gives them three sermons to teach them *how they may be justified* by a true and lively faith.

The writer before us would have included justifying faith in baptism; taking it for granted to have been present *then*; and little disturbed if no signs of its existence should ever afterwards have appeared.

But the authors of the Book of Homilies thought differently. They judged it to be of vast importance that nothing should be taken for granted in this matter; and therefore they give three

more sermons to the definition of a *true and lively faith*. And through all these six discourses,—three on Justification and three on Faith,—the idea of a justification from actual sin by baptism never once occurs.

On the contrary, those who take their own faith for granted are warned, that “every man should examine and try himself diligently, to know whether he have this true and lively faith in his heart, or not?”

“Now this obviously implies, that although a “baptized Christian,” it was possible that he might be destitute of a true and lively faith. But if he *had not* faith, then clearly he could not have been *justified* by faith,—even though he had been baptized.

But the last sermon on Faith ends thus:—

“And like as the devils and evil people be nothing the better for their counterfeit faith, but it is unto them the more cause of damnation; so they that *be christened*, and have received knowledge of God, and of Christ’s merits, and yet of a set purpose do live idly *without good works*, thinking *the name of a naked faith* to be either sufficient for them, or else setting their minds upon the vain pleasures of this world, do live in sin without repentance, not uttering the fruits that do belong to such an high profession; upon such *presumptuous persons*, and wilful sinners, must needs remain the great vengeance of God, and eternal punishment in hell, prepared for the unjust and wicked livers. Therefore, as you profess the name of Christ, good Christian people, let no such fantasy and *imagination of faith* at any time beguile you; but be sure of your faith, *try it by your living*, look upon the fruits that come of it, mark the increase of love and charity by it towards God and your neighbour, and so shall you perceive it to be a true lively faith. If you feel and perceive such a faith in you, rejoice in it; and be diligent to maintain it, and keep it still in you; let it be daily increasing, and more and more by well working, and so shall you be sure that you shall please God by this faith; and at the length, as other faithful men have done before, so shall you, when his will is, come to him, and receive *the end and final reward of your faith*, as St. Peter nameth it, *the salvation of your souls*, 1 Peter i. the which God grant us, that hath promised the same unto his faithful: to whom be all honour and glory, world without end.”

Nothing can be more contrary to the teaching of the writer we have under notice; who asserts the right of all baptized persons to say, “being justified by faith, we have peace with God,”—without a syllable of examination touching the fruits of faith, or their absence.

Lastly, we may mention three other sermons on Repentance, described as “a *conversion*, or turning again of the whole man to God.” The writer now under our notice would eschew this mode of speech, finding conversion, as well as justification, in baptism, and nowhere else. “The Church,” he says, “has not encouraged “the modern habit of dating conversion, or of taking cognizance “of any marked epoch in a man’s life, *besides his baptism*.” Yes, the Church has. In these three Sermons or Homilies on Repentance, the Church throughout addresses “baptized Christians,” and seeks their conversion. She quotes the cases of Manasseh, Magdalene, Zaccheus, the Thief on the Cross, and others,—as instances of “marked epochs” of conversion, apart from baptism.

Neither in Scripture, then, nor in the authorized teaching of the Church, do we find any such aversion to the preaching of repentance and the necessity of conversion, to baptised Christians, as this writer evidently feels. On the contrary, both the Liturgy and the Homilies of the Church abound in calls to the unconverted; and in earnest exhortations to repentance. That in the Communion Service, (addressed to baptised persons) may be cited as one, “If any among you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer “or slanderer of his word; an adulterer; or be in malice, or envy, “or any other grievous crime, repent ye of your sins, or else come “not to that holy table.”

Now we will venture to assert, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that the earnest and faithful minister of the Gospel is scarcely to be found, who must not of necessity class a large portion of his congregation,—in most cases the *larger* portion,—under some of these heads of offence. And to *such*, assuredly, the Bible plan,—the plan of the Church of England,—is, not to tell them of their “baptismal privileges,” or to assure them that they are *already* justified, and need no conversion; but to adopt the language of the Homilies, and to shew them, first, the misery of man, themselves distinctly included; then, the way of salvation, by faith in Christ Jesus, leading to full and free justification, adoption, and sanctification: and, thirdly, to proceed to discriminate between true, and false or dead, faith; between a sound and an unreal repentance, and hence through the remaining steps of the Divine life. Such is “the Church’s teaching;” we need hardly say, how utterly opposed it is to such delusions as that against which we have been contending.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST DELINEATED IN TWO
ESSAYS. By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., Archbishop of
Dublin. London. 8vo. B. Fellowes. 1841.

WE have here a discussion, by one of the leading minds of the day, on two great questions :—1. Our Lord's own account of His person, and of the nature of His kingdom : and, 2. The Constitution, Powers, and Ministry of a Christian Church. These essays have all the characteristics of Dr. Whately's style of thought and reasoning. They fall below the recent productions of Dr. Arnold and Mr. Benson ; lacking the force and energy of the first, and the beauty and persuasive eloquence of the second. They have also faults which were not perceptible in either of those writers ; approaching, as it appears to us, too near the confines of religious "liberalism." Still they are valuable contributions to the great controversy which occupies all minds at the present day. A single extract will exhibit the learned author in the full activity of his penetrating mind :—

" But as there are some persons who are too ready to separate from any religious community on slight grounds, or even, through mere caprice, to 'heap up to themselves teachers, having itching ears,' it has been thought,—or at least maintained,—that the only way of affording complete satisfaction and repose to the scrupulous, and of repressing schism, is to uphold, under the title of 'Church-principles,' the doctrine that no one is a member of Christ's Church, and an heir of the covenanted gospel-promises, who is not under a ministry ordained by Bishops descended in an unbroken chain from the Apostles.

" Now what is the degree of satisfactory assurance that is thus afforded to the scrupulous consciences of any members of an episcopal Church ? If a man consider it as highly *probable* that the *particular minister* at whose hands he receives the sacred ordinances, is really thus apostolically descended, *this* is the very utmost point to which he can, with any semblance of reason, attain : and the more he reflects and inquires, the more cause for hesitation he will find. There is not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up with any approach to certainty his own spiritual pedigree. The sacramental virtue (for such it is, that is implied,—whether the term be used or not,—in the principle I have been speaking of) dependent on the imposition of hands, with a due observance of apostolical usages, by a Bishop, himself duly consecrated, after having been in like manner baptized into the Church, and ordained Deacon and Priest,—this sacramental virtue, if a single link of the chain be faulty, must, on the above principles, be utterly nullified ever after, in respect of all the links that hang on that one. For if a Bishop has not been duly consecrated, or had not been, previously, rightly ordained, his ordinations are null ; and so are the ministrations of those ordained by him ; and their ordination of others ; (supposing any of the persons ordained by him to attain to the episcopal office) and so on, without end. The poisonous taint of informality, if it once creep in undetected, will spread the infection of nullity to an indefinite and irremediable extent.

" And who can undertake to pronounce that during that long period

usually designated as the Dark Ages, no such taint ever was introduced. Irregularities could not have been wholly excluded without a perpetual miracle; and that no such miraculous interference existed, we have even historical proof. Amidst the numerous corruptions of doctrine and of practice, and gross superstitions, that crept in, during those ages, we find recorded descriptions not only of the profound ignorance and profligacy of life, of many of the Clergy; but also of the grossest irregularities in respect of discipline and form. We read of Bishops consecrated when mere children;—of men officiating who barely knew their letters;—of Prelates expelled, and others put into their places, by violence;—of illiterate and profligate laymen, and habitual drunkards, admitted to holy orders; and in short, of the prevalence of every kind of disorder, and reckless disregard of the decency which the Apostle enjoins. It is inconceivable that any one even moderately acquainted with history, can feel a certainty, or any approach to certainty, that, amidst all this confusion and corruption, every requisite form, was, in every instance, strictly adhered to, by men, many of them openly profane and secular, unrestrained by public opinion, through the gross ignorance of the population among which they lived; and that no one not duly consecrated or ordained, was admitted to sacred offices.

“ Even in later and more civilized and enlightened times, the probability of an irregularity, though very greatly diminished, is yet diminished only, and not absolutely destroyed. Even in the memory of persons living, there existed a Bishop concerning whom there was so much mystery and uncertainty prevailing as to when, where, and by whom, he had been ordained, that doubts existed in the mind of many persons whether he had ever been ordained at all. I do not say that there was good ground for the suspicion: but I speak of the fact, that it did prevail; and that the circumstances of the case were such as to make manifest the *possibility* of such an irregularity occurring under such circumstances.

“ Now, let any one proceed on the hypothesis that there are, suppose, but a hundred links connecting any particular minister with the Apostles; and let him even suppose that not above half of this number pass through such periods as admit of any possible irregularity; and then, placing at the lowest estimate the probability of defectiveness in respect of each of the remaining fifty, taken separately, let him consider what amount of probability will result from the *multiplying* of the whole together. The ultimate consequence must be that any one who sincerely believes that his claim to the benefits of the gospel-covenant depends on his own minister's claim to the supposed sacramental virtue of true ordination, and this again, on perfect apostolical succession as above described, must be involved, in proportion as he reads and inquires, and reflects, and reasons, on the subject, in the most distressing doubt and perplexity.

“ It is no wonder, therefore, that the advocates of this theory studiously disparage reasoning, deprecate all exercise of the mind in reflection, decry appeals to evidence, and lament that even the power of reading should be imparted to the people. It is not without cause that they dread and lament ‘an age of too much light,’ and wish to involve religion in ‘a solemn and awful gloom.’ It is not without cause that, having removed the Christian's confidence from a rock, to base it on sand, they forbid all prying curiosity to examine their foundation.”—(pp. 175—179.)

We will add a second passage, of the same lucid and striking character:—

“ But moreover, not from our own Church only, but from the universal Church,—from all the privileges and promises of the gospel,—the principles I am condemning go to exclude, if fairly followed out, the very persons who advocate them. For it is certain that our own institutions and practices (and the like may be said, I apprehend, of every other Church in the world

though not, we conceive, *at variance* with any apostolical injunctions, or with any gospel-principle, are, in several points, not precisely coincident with those of the earliest Churches. The Agapæ for instance, or 'Love-feasts,' alluded to just above, have, in most Churches, been long discontinued. The 'widows' again, whom we find mention of in Paul's Epistles, appear plainly to have been an order of Deaconesses regularly appointed to particular functions in the earliest Churches: and their Deacons appear to have had an office considerable different from those of our Church.

"Again, it seems plainly to have been at least the general, if not the universal, practice of the Apostles, to appoint over each separate *Church* a *single* individual as a chief Governor, under the title of '*Angel*' (i. e. *Messenger* or *Legate* from the Apostles) or '*Bishop*,' i. e. *Superintendent* or *Overseer*. A CHURCH and a DIOCESE seem to have been for a considerable time *coextensive* and *identical*. And each Church or Diocese (and consequently each Superintendent) though connected with the rest by ties of Faith and Hope and Charity, seems to have been (as has been already observed) perfectly independent as far as regards any power of control.

"The plan pursued by the Apostles seems to have been, as has been above remarked, to establish a great number of small (in comparison with most modern Churches) distinct and independent Communities, each governed by its own single Bishop; consulting, no doubt, with his own Presbyters, and accustomed to act in concurrence with them, and occasionally conferring with the Brethren in other Churches, but owing no submission to the rulers of any other Church, or to any central common authority except the Apostles themselves. And other points of difference might be added.

"Now to vindicate the institutions of our own, or of some other Church, on the ground that they 'are not in themselves superstitious or ungodly,'—that they are not at variance with gospel-principles, or with any divine injunction that was designed to be of universal obligation, is intelligible and reasonable. But to vindicate them on the ground of the exact conformity, which it is notorious they do not possess, to the most ancient models, and even to go beyond this, and condemn all Christians whose institutions and ordinances are not 'one and utterly like' our own, on the ground of their departure from the Apostolical precedents, which no Church has exactly adhered to,—does seem—to use no harsher expression,—not a little inconsistent and unreasonable. And yet one may not unfrequently hear members of Episcopalian Churches pronouncing severe condemnation on those of other Communion, and even excluding them from the Christian body, on the ground, not of their not being under the *best* form of Ecclesiastical Government, but, of their wanting the very essentials of a Christian Church; viz. the very same distinct Orders in the Hierarchy that the Apostles appointed: and this, while the Episcopalians themselves have, universally, so far varied from the Apostolical institution as to have in one Church several *Bishops*; each of whom consequently differs in the office he holds, in a most important point, from one of the primitive Bishops, as much as the Governor of any one of our Colonies does from a Sovereign Prince.

"Now whether the several alterations, and departures from the original institutions, were or were not, in each instance, made on good grounds, in accordance with an altered state of society, is a question which cannot even be entertained by those who hold that no Church is competent to vary at all from the ancient model. Their principle would go to exclude at once from the pale of Christ's Church almost every Christian body since the first two or three centuries.

"The edifice they overthrow crushes in its fall the blind champion who has broken its pillars."—(pp. 128—131.)

The works of such a writer as this, one would be apt to suppose, must always command attention, and enforce either conviction or

an attempt at reply. Yet the Archbishop, in his preface, seems to complain of the disregarded silence with which his former publications have been received:—

“ Though opposite views are maintained by many writers of the present day, several of them professed members of the Church of England, I have never seen even an attempted refutation of any of those arguments.

“ It cannot be alleged that they are not worth noticing : since, whether intrinsically weak or strong, the reception they have met with from the public indicates their having had some influence.”—(p. viii.)

Shall we point out one or two minor circumstances in his Grace's mode of dealing with controversy, which tend somewhat, we apprehend, to cause, or to encourage, this apparent inattention.

Among these, a principal one, we apprehend, is his Grace's use of the expedient which, in this preface, he recommends to others:—

“ Nothing is easier, or more common, and, I should add, nothing more advisable, than to notice in *general* terms the opinions or arguments opposed to one's own, and without reference to any particular book or author : as by saying, for instance, ‘ Such and such a doctrine has been held ; ’—‘ this or that may be alleged ; ’—‘ some persons may object so and so, ’ &c. In this way, not only personal controversy may be avoided, without undue neglect of what may be said on the opposite side, but also the advantage is gained (to the cause of truth, I mean) of confining the reader's attention to the real merits of the case, independently of the extraneous circumstances, which ought not to influence the decision.”—(pp. viii, ix.)

Now, whatever “ advantage may thus be gained,” a far greater one is certainly lost. The reader is sure to be more attracted and interested by a *personal* encounter, however dispassionately and Christianly conducted, than by the naked enunciation of opposing reasonings in their abstract form. It is this very circumstance which casts a certain dryness and coldness over Dr. Whately's argumentations. He quotes opponents without naming either themselves or their works. The reader is lost in doubt, whether such and such things have ever been said,—when, where, or by whom ; and a dissatisfaction also arises, at being deprived of all opportunity of examining the opponents' reasonings in their own pages. Dr. Whately may rest assured that his future “ *Essays* ” will be read with far greater interest, if, without in the least abating the *suaviter in modo* which distinguishes his writings,—he condescends to particularize the reasonings and the writings against which his arguments are directed.

But we have a further point to touch upon, before we quit the present volume. The Archbishop is somewhat too low a Churchman for our taste,—too low, we think, for truth. The principle of a Christian Church-State commonwealth appears to have no place in his mind. The Church, in this volume, seems never to occupy any higher place than that of a voluntary association, such as those

of the Jesuits or the Freemasons. He speaks of our Lord's "design to establish what should be emphatically a social religion,—a 'Fellowship,' or 'Communion of Saints.'" Again he says, "Christ's design manifestly was, to adapt His religion to the social principles of man's nature; and to bind his disciples, throughout all ages, to each other, by those ties of mutual attachment, sympathy, and co-operation, *which in every human community and association*, of whatever kind, are found so powerful." (pp. 54, 55.)

In accordance with this low view of the position and standing of the Church in the world, his Grace's interpretation of the much-litigated text, "*My kingdom is not of this world*," differs little, if at all, from that of Dr. Wardlaw:—

"But had Christ then some *hidden* meaning, which he did *not* intend to be understood at the time? Did he design to convey one sense to the Roman governor, and another to his own disciples?—to reserve for his followers in future times, that power to enforce the acknowledgment of his Gospel, which he *pretended* to disclaim.

"It seems almost too shocking even to ask such a question: and yet it is but too true, that such, in substance, (however glossed over in words) must be the meaning attributed to our blessed Lord by those who would reconcile his declarations before Pilate with that which they represent as the right and the duty of every Christian governor. 'The magistrate,' they say, (I am giving the very words that have been employed) 'who restrains, coerces, and punishes any one who opposes the true faith, obeys the command of God:' and they contend that a Christian governor is not only authorized, but bound, to secure to the professors of the true faith a monopoly of political power and civil rights. Now, to reconcile such doctrines with the declarations of Christ and his Apostles, a meaning must be attributed to those declarations which it would have been madness for them to have *avowed* at the time;—in short, a *hidden* meaning.

It is recorded of an ancient king of Egypt,—one of the Ptolemies—that he employed a celebrated architect to build a magnificent light-house, for the benefit of shipping, and ordered an inscription in honour of himself to be engraved on it: the architect, it is said, though inwardly coveting the honour of such a record for *himself*, was obliged to comply; but made the inscription on a plaster resembling stone, but of perishable substance: in the course of years this crumbled away; and the next generation saw *another* inscription, recording the name, not of the King, but of the architect, which had been secretly engraven on the durable stone below.

"Now, just such a device as this is attributed to our Lord and his Apostles by those who believe them to have designed that secular power should hereafter be called in to enforce the Christian faith, though all such designs were *apparently* disavowed, in order to serve a present purpose. According to such interpreters, 'My kingdom is not of this world,' was only an inscription on the perishable plaster: the design of 'coercing and punishing' by secular power all opponents of the true faith, was, it seems, the engraving on the stone beneath. 'Render unto Cæsar the things that be Cæsar's,' was but the outward part of the inscription; the addition was an inner hidden engraving, directing that Christians, when become strong enough, should compel both Cæsar and his subjects,—all rulers and all citizens—either to acknowledge the true faith, or to forfeit their civil rights. It was the *outside* inscription only that ran thus, 'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man; * * * the powers that be, are ordained of God:' the secret cha-

racters on the *stone* said, 'Take care as soon as possible to make every ordinance of man submit to *you*,' and to provide that none but those of your own body shall be in authority; and that they shall use that authority in enforcing the profession of your religion.

"It might seem incredible did we not know it to be the fact, that persons professing a deep reverence for Christ and his Apostles as heaven-sent messengers, should attribute to them this double-dealing;—should believe them to have secretly entertained and taught the very views of which their adversaries accused them, and which they uniformly disclaimed, that the blessed Jesus Himself, who rebukes *hypocrisy* more strongly than perhaps any other sin, should be regarded by his professed followers as having pretended to disavow that which was his real design, and which He imparted to his Apostles; teaching *them* in like manner to keep the secret till they should be strong enough to assert the political supremacy of the gospel, and to extirpate, or hold in subjection as vassals, all professors of false religions.

"All this, I say, might seem hardly credible, did not daily experience show us how easily (not only in this but in other cases also) even intelligent men are satisfied with the slightest pretences of argument—with the most extravagant conclusions—when they are seeking, not really for *instruction* as to what they *ought* to do, but for a *justification* of what they are *inclined* to do. Such a bias of inclination, is like the magnet which is said to have been once secretly placed near a ship's compass, by a traitor who purposed to deliver the crew into the enemy's hands. All their diligence and skill in working the ship and steering by this perverted compass, served only to further them on the wrong course.

"Without presuming to pronounce judgment on the general moral character of others, I cannot forbear saying, for myself, that if I could believe Jesus to have been guilty of such subterfuges as I have been speaking of, I not only could not acknowledge him as sent from God, but should reject him with the *deepest moral indignation*.

"How far this indignant disgust may have been excited in the breasts of some who have taken for granted, on the authority of learned and zealous divines, that the interpretation I have been reprobating is to be received, and who may, in consequence, have *rejected Christianity* with abhorrence, it is for those who maintain such an interpretation carefully to consider."—(pp. 35—39.)

In a passage at the commencement of this argument, we have, in an apparent quotation from some other work, a striking example of the undesirableness of Dr. Whately's plan of conducting controversy. He professes to quote, and to refute, a printed work. But he does not name it; nor does he quote accurately. Of course justice is neither done to the opponent nor to the reader by such a course. Here is his Grace's representation:—

"'The magistrate,' they say, (I am giving the very words that have been employed) 'who restrains, coerces, and punishes any one who opposes the true faith, obeys the command of God;' and they contend that a Christian governor is not only authorized, but bound, to secure to the professors of the true faith a monopoly of political power and civil rights." (p. 36.)

But the statement he is combating runs thus in the original:—

"The simple fact, however, is, that there is but one true religion; and there never has been, nor ever will be, any other. All

the rest are false, ruinous, and opposed to the honour of God. This cannot be too often or too strongly stated, or too constantly kept in view. The inferences are obvious. The Christian, who goes into a Pagan country, and there attacks the existing religion, exposes the character of the false gods, and instigates the people to throw off their yoke—acts laudably and well. The unbeliever on the other hand, who goes forth among our Christian population, assaults their faith, speaks evil of the Son of God, and aims to overthrow his worship,—acts wickedly, and against the law of God. The magistrate who restrains, and coerces, or punishes the first of these characters, opposes himself to God, and is a persecutor. The magistrate who restrains, coerces, or punishes the second, obeys the command of God, and is not a persecutor. So entirely are these matters governed by this one simple and eternal truth;—that there is but one revelation of the will of God, and of the way of salvation; that such revelation is published to all mankind, with abundant evidence of its verity; and that to it universal obedience is due.” *

The reader will judge for himself, whether Dr. Whately's abridged and paraphrased quotation gives a fair view of the argument he professes to be refuting.

But now to the matter in dispute. This involves two questions:—1. The correct interpretation of the words of Christ, in reply to Pilate: 2. The obligations of rulers, with reference to Christianity, as exhibited in Holy Writ, taken as a whole.

On the first of these points, we readily and entirely concede to Dr. Whately, that the only safe mode of dealing with the words of our Lord, is to discover, and to accept them in, the sense in which they must have been understood by those to whom they were addressed.

Now surely there can be little difficulty in ascertaining this. We are ready to adopt one of Dr. Whately's own statements: “It was the assumption of *temporal* power that threatened danger to the Romans; and it was of this assumption that Jesus was accused: *did he not distinctly deny it?*” (p. 31.) The answer cannot but be in the affirmative.

The history of the transaction is abundantly plain. “The multitude arose, and led him unto Pilate; and began to accuse Him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute unto Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a King. And Pilate asked Him, saying, ‘Art thou the King of the Jews?’” (Luke xxiii. 1—3.) St. John adds ano-

* *Essays on the Church*, 1838, p. 36.

ther question put by Pilate,—“ *What hast thou done?* ”—obviously meaning, “ What act of sedition hast thou committed, to excite all this commotion ? ” To which our Lord replies, “ My kingdom is “ not of this world : if my kingdom were of this world, then would “ my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews : “ but now is my kingdom not from hence.” (John xviii. 36.)

The whole of this reply is strictly germane to the governor's interrogation. The charge brought against Jesus was one of sedition and treason ;—that he stirred up the people ; incited them to rebel against Cæsar ; and offered himself as their temporal ruler and head, in Cæsar's room. This, then, was the point on which Pilate interrogated his prisoner ; and to this point his replies were directed. He utterly denies the charge : and points out the passiveness of his adherents as a proof of the groundlessness of the charge. But he could not, and did not, deny that He was appointed to a kingdom ; only he entirely disclaimed sedition, treason, or, in fact, any political machinations, as the means to be employed in setting it up. “ My kingdom is not of this world ”—“ My “ kingdom is not *from hence*.” Now we desire to take our Lord's words in their fair and legitimate meaning,—in the meaning in which Pilate must have taken them. The Roman governor must have accepted them as conveying a plea of Not Guilty to the charge. He accepted that plea ; and declares the prisoner free from the fault alleged against Him,—namely, sedition. But if any one had asked Pilate, immediately after—“ Did you understand the prisoner to mean, that when Cæsar himself should become a follower of His own, and should reckon the title of ‘ Christian ’ as his highest privilege,—he, Cæsar, would be debarred from using his imperial authority in furthering the spread of this religion ? ”—would not Pilate have replied, without a moment's hesitation, “ I understood nothing of the kind, neither did such a thing enter into my mind. I questioned him as to his alleged sedition and conspiracy against Cæsar ; and I took his disclaimer to apply to that alone.”

Adopting, then, to its full extent, Dr. Whately's own canon—of “ keeping in mind the occasion on which Christ was speaking ; “ and the sense in which He must have known that His language “ would be understood,”—we arrive at the conclusion, that Pilate never could have understood Him to mean ;—and therefore, that *He did not mean*—in simply pleading not guilty to a charge of sedition—to renounce, for his followers, in all ages, the duty and the obligation of using their authority, whether regal or legislative, in the lawful spread of his truth.

Dr. Whately, however, cannot resist the temptation before

which so many myriads of controversialists have fallen—of misrepresenting his opponents' arguments. In quoting an incomplete sentence from the *Essays on the Church*, he adds to it this unfair enlargement;—"they contend that a Christian Governor is not "only authorized, but bound, to secure to the professors of the "true faith, a *monopoly of political power and civil rights.*" Who they are that thus "contend," we know not. Certainly Dr. Whateley will find no such assumption in the book from which he had just been quoting. One thing, probably, its author might wish to "contend" for,—namely, that those who desire to refute his statements would at least be candid enough to quote them in his own words; and not to ascribe to him things which he never wrote, nor even imagined.

But to the point at issue; the obligation of rulers, in these matters. We know not whether to adopt Mr. Gladstone's way of stating the principle—that "the State has a conscience;" but of this we have a clear conviction—that the same obligation which rests upon every Christian, in his individual capacity, to honour God, and to advance his truth, follows him into every function and relation of life; and is never lost, *nor yet diminished*, by his being called on to act in conjunction with two, three, or two or three hundred, of his fellow-men. "*Thy kingdom come!*" ought to be his grand aim and object, as well as his daily prayer. And if it is so, he will not, as a Ruler or Legislator, adopt the sort of rule of action which Dr. Whately has described,—of "securing to the professors of the true faith a "*monopoly of political power and civil rights;*"—but he will go all the length defined in the *Essays on the Church*—of "restraining, coercing, and punishing the man, who goes forth "among our Christian population, to assault their faith, to speak "evil of the Son of God, and to seek to overthrow His worship." In fact, if offenders against morals are to be restrained at all, upon what intelligible principle shall we exempt *him*, who, in attacking religion, attacks morals and social order in their very foundation?

We would not desire to evade, or deny, the delicacy of the question, as to where the line is to be drawn—which divides a necessary and lawful toleration, from that offensiveness of interference which constitutes the first degree of persecution. But when we find, in the only safe guide on these questions, such a sentiment as this;—"If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon "walking in brightness; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, "or my mouth hath kissed my hand: this also were an iniquity "to be punished by the judge; for I should have denied the God

“that is above.” (Job xxxi. 26—28.)—when we find, we repeat, such a sentiment as this, so sanctioned and recorded, we cannot feel much hesitation in concluding, that Christian legislators are not overstepping the path of duty, when they coercively restrain the open impugnors of Divine Truth. Doubtless this principle may be, and often is, strained by the superstitious, to cover and defend their frauds and fictions from the assaults of argument. And this makes it the more necessary, to adhere firmly to that most essential principle of the Church of England;—that “it is not lawful to ordain anything that is *contrary* to God’s word;” “nor to enforce anything *beside the same*,” to be “believed for necessity of salvation.”

THE PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND.

To which are added Two Sermons by Bishop Sanderson. By the Rev. FRANCIS FULFORD, M.A., Rector of Trowbridge, Wilts. London: Rivingtons. 1841.

Mr. FULFORD deserves praise for the diligence with which he has collected and brought together, in so small a compass, a number of important, and, if allowance be made for certain strongly-marked partialities, trustworthy particulars, relative to the gradual deliverance of the Church of England from Papal domination, and “erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God’s word.” *

We take, however, some objection to the title of his book, as holding forth too large an expectation, and as being in other respects not perfectly correct. If we pass over certain “extracts from Clarendon’s History of the Rebellion, and Icon Basilikê,” Bishop Sanderson’s Sermons occupy the greater portion of the volume, the title of which might therefore be advantageously, and with some gain on the score of modesty, amended by its compiler as follows:—“Two Sermons by Bishop Sanderson, with a Brief Introductory Notice of the Reformation in the Church of England.”

* Ordination Service.

The following extracts from his Preface will show that Mr. Fulford's own authority may be appealed to in support of this, as we think, improved reading.

"I have thought it might be useful to reprint, in a small volume, two of his (Sanderson's) excellent sermons," &c.

"I have, *by way of introduction*, prefixed a little treatise on the progress of the Reformation in England," &c.—(Preface, p. 14.)

It may be further remarked that the first of the sermons—"of Conformity and Non-conformity"—is only printed from the seventeenth section onwards; a circumstance of which the title-page gives no intimation.

But our objections to Mr. Fulford's volume do not, we regret to say, end with his title-page. We cannot at all approve of the spirit in which his task has been executed. It appears to us to be strongly marked by that bitter hostility towards protestants of other communions than that of the English Church, which has of late years so grievously manifested itself amongst us. We pray God, of his great mercy, to deliver us from this temper of our "perilous times." Its tendency can only be (especially when the proportionate leaning towards Rome is taken into the account) to widen the breach between our brethren and ourselves; "so that," to quote Bishop Sanderson's words, "if things shall still go on, according as they have begun, and hitherto proceeded, the application which some have made of that passage, *Venient Romani, et capient gentem nostram*, will prove but too true a prophecy; and Popery will overturn all at the last."

We are no latitudinarians. It is our settled conviction that our beloved Church is in nearest accord, both in doctrine and discipline, with the primitive model set forth in the writings of apostles and evangelists. But while we acknowledge and glory in this our, as we trust, enlightened preference for her whose "foundations," like those of Zion, are "the everlasting hills," we can neither brand as universally involved in the guilt of "schism," nor as "the chance offspring of human ingenuity," all other protestant communities (including the Lutheran Church in Germany, and the Church of Scotland) who differ from us in the mode whereby they worship one common God and Father, through one common Mediator and Redeemer.

This we take to be the great blot which deforms Mr. Fulford's history, and neutralizes, to a lamentable extent, the good which otherwise it might be expected to produce. As a compressed and generally correct narrative of the events which it undertakes to record, we have already bestowed upon it the meed of our approbation; and bearing in mind the protest we have

already entered against its exclusive and sectarian spirit, it may probably be read with some advantage.

The character and writings of Bishop Sanderson, as well as the part which he sustained in the hardest trial through which the Church and Monarchy of England ever passed, present too wide a field to allow of our taking them up just now. Opportunity may be afforded us hereafter of entering upon these interesting topics. For the present we conclude with a quotation from his sermon "of Conformity and Non-conformity," which is full of sound practical wisdom, and to none more suitable than to the men of this generation :—

"It is no wrong to the liberty of a Christian man's conscience to bind him to outward observance for order's sake, and to impose upon him a necessity of obedience; for to make all restraint of the outward man in matters indifferent an impeachment of Christian liberty, what were it else, but to bring anarchy into the Church, and to overthrow all bond of subjection and obedience to lawful authority? I beseech you, consider, wherein can the immediate power and authority of fathers, masters, and other rulers over their inferiors consist, or the due obedience of inferiors be shown towards them, if not in these indifferent and arbitrary things? For things absolutely necessary, as commended by God, we are bound to do, whether human authority require them or no; and things absolutely unlawful, as prohibited by God, we are bound not to do, whether human authority forbid them or no. There are none other things left, then, wherein to express properly the obedience due to superior authority, than these indifferent things. And if a father or master have power to prescribe to his child or servant indifferent things, and such restraint be no way prejudicial to Christian liberty in them, why should any man either deny the like power to Church governors' to make ecclesiastical constitutions concerning indifferent things, or interpret that power to the prejudice of Christian liberty."— (pp. 79, 80.)

THE
CHURCHMAN'S MONTHLY REVIEW.

DECEMBER, 1841.

THE CLAIMS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH: *a Sermon, preached in the Chapel of St. Mary Magdalen College, before the University of Oxford, on the Feast of St. Mark the Evangelist, A.D. MCCCXLI.* By RICHARD WALDO SIBTHORP, B.D., Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College, and Minister of St. James's Church, Ryde. London: *Rivingtons.* 1841.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH: *an Essay.* By the Rev. WILLIAM GILLMOR, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Illingworth, Yorkshire. London: *Rivingtons.* 1841.

IN forming our estimate of those principles which ultra-Churchmen have within the last few years so sedulously laboured to introduce amongst us, our fears for the result are not so much that any considerable number of persons will adopt those views, as that many may be driven to the opposite extreme, and count too lightly of the doctrine of Church membership. It is not the event of two or three individuals going from the communion of the Church of England back again to the errors of Rome that we deplore so much, as the mischief which such examples cause, by raising strong prejudices even against those things which are common both to the Church of Rome and our own. It is owing to this successful device of Satan (we mean that of turning men's minds upon extreme views of things indifferent in themselves) that the history of the reformed Churches is a series of reactions, passing alternately from the principles of popery to those of dissent, and from dissent

to an undue exaltation of the Christian ministry and sacraments. It would become a subject of a too metaphysical kind for us, to analyze the workings of the mind which lead to these results; but the fact we state is incontrovertible. We might refer to the times of Cromwell as compared with the lofty pretensions of the school of Archbishop Laud, and again to the profligacy and high Church notions of the age of Charles II. and his successors, as compared with the hypocrisy and presbyterianism of the commonwealth. It might afford a very useful and instructive lesson to some of our Oxford divines to examine these oscillations, and then, referring to the times and writings of our eminent reformers, (which the Parker Society will furnish them with) to find the point where the true Churchman should rest. It is not a little remarkable that the few clergymen who are now rendering themselves conspicuous by urging what they call the claims of the Catholic Church, were but a short time ago nearly as ripe for joining the dissenters as they are now for joining the Church of Rome. We could name several reverend persons, at this moment, whose lives and opinions would furnish each an illustration of that feature of the reformed Church history, to which we have alluded. Being, perhaps, less honest and simple-minded than the author of the pamphlet, whose title we have placed at the head of this article, they still remain a dead weight upon our Church, eating her bread whilst lifting up their heel against her. We sincerely trust that as these reverend persons now stand rebuked by episcopal authority,* for which they profess more than ordinary veneration, they will cease to trouble the flock, and will return to the religious principles of the reformation; or else, that, as honest men, they will at once follow the example of the Spencers and the Sibthorps, and allow the Right Reverend Dr. Wiseman to rejoice over some more instances of human weakness to swell the annals of the Church of Rome.

We are not, however, disposed to treat any subject which affects the interests of our fellow creatures with levity or derision; it is rather our duty to endeavour to account for those religious aberrations which excite men's surprise, and to point out to others where the danger lies, of making shipwreck of faith and a good conscience.

In Mr. Sibthorp's Sermon before the University of Oxford, we have the idea (although not fully expanded), which has finally led that gentleman to the Church of Rome:—

“ We see men going out into life to live for their country, their neighbourhood, their families, their selected professions,—laudable principles of action

* *Vide the Charges of the Bishops of Chester, Winchester, Durham, Gloucester, Lincoln, Exeter, &c. &c.*

each in its due degree ; but what a mistake (for what a departure from the design of God) do we make if we have not an higher principle than any of these—if we do not enter life, if we do not live, for the Catholic Church of Christ, and seek the divine glory in that sphere pointed out to us by Christianity itself. For this principle will include other lower principles, and be a main-spring of life, regulating all lesser movements, at once subordinating and empowering them. But without this, every other aim, yea all aims put together, however energetically and effectively pursued, will but make our lives a grand mistake, which the day of judgment will shew," &c.—(p. 12.)

When Ignatius Loyola submitted the rules of his order to Pope Paul III. for confirmation, the Cardinal Guidiccioni strongly advised his holiness to refuse his assent. The founder of the Jesuit order stated that he and his adherents would henceforth "live for the Catholic Church, and that this principle should include all other principles, and be a mainspring of life regulating all lesser movements, and at once subordinating and empowering them." But the article in which he promised to obey the pope was qualified with certain restrictions ; and the wily cardinal perceived that such a power, if not entirely wielded by the Sovereign Pontiff, must end in supplanting his authority. Ignatius had the address to modify the article, and to vow that he and his order would live for the Pope alone. The Jesuit might be sincere in believing that what he called the Catholic Church, as personified in the Pope of Rome, had an exclusive claim upon his time and energies, and that "without this every other aim, yea all aims put together, however energetically and effectively procured, would make his life but a grand mistake." Now all that the writer of the above-cited paragraph required to carry out his notion of Christian duty into practice, was, to fix upon a community to which he could attach the title of *the* Catholic Church. When once he has satisfied himself that there is a visible church to which that title exclusively belongs, he knows what he has to live for. Why he should select the Church of Rome any more than the Church of Greece, might just depend upon the hands into which he happened to fall ; but with his principle, which includes all others, we were not surprised at all to hear of his joining that Church, which advances an exclusive claim to be called the Catholic Church. The reverend convert says nothing about living to the glory of God and the good of mankind, and serving God in his holy Church, wherever he finds a pure and reformed part of it established. His whole life, he thinks, would be a grand mistake if he were so to live ; but he sets out to live for *the* Catholic Church, which he believes he has discovered to be the Church of Rome in particular. Now it is this principle laid down by Mr. Sibthorp and his colleagues which we deny. To live for any particular Church is to be a sectarian ; to live for the Church Catholic is to live for the Church which Christ has purchased with his own

blood. It will be found that the whole question in dispute turns upon the distinction that exists between *a* Church and *the* Church of Christ, which is (not the Church of Rome nor the Church of England), but which is *His body*, "the blessed company of all faithful people." In the Tracts for the Times, No. 74, "the doctrine in dispute" is thus stated, "That Christ founded a visible Church as an ordinance for ever, and endowed it once for all with spiritual privileges, and set his apostles over it, as the first in a line of ministers and rulers, like themselves, except in their miraculous gifts, and to be continued from them by successive ordination; in consequence that to adhere to this Church thus distinguished is among the ordinary duties of a Christian, and is the means of his appropriating the gospel blessings, with an evidence of his doing so not attainable elsewhere." The same erroneous principle is involved here as in the former case, viz., that it is necessary, before a Christian can discharge his ordinary duties, to attach himself to a particular Church. Whereas we affirm that our Lord never did attach such exclusive privileges to any Church; and the error arises, from not making the distinction between *the* Church, which is Christ's body, and a visible Church, which, as our article says, may err.

Every reader of the Scriptures knows well that the term Church is used in very different senses. We hear of the Churches of Galatia, and of Judea, as so many separate congregations—the church at Jerusalem, the church at Corinth, the seven churches of Asia, and others. Sometimes a party of believers gathered together in a private house was called a Church; as, the Church in the house of Nymphas. Such a church was nothing else but the believing and baptized persons of each household, and such as were permitted to join them. We are sure that all those churches were originally founded upon the rock, which is Christ, and upon the preaching of the Apostles; but not one of them could lay claim to the title of *the* Church Catholic, in any other sense than as being a part of a whole; and even if all of them should have been taken as a whole and called the Church, it could not mean the Church which Christ had purchased with his own blood; for among those churches there were many who never became members of Christ's Church which is His body. In order to compose that Church for which Christ died, and which He said He would build upon the rock, and promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against it, it seems to us that a selection must be made out of all those churches, of such as truly love and serve God, and this body so selected is *the* Church. It is "a congregation of faithful men, wherein the pure word of God is preached and the Sacraments duly administered;" it is a peculiar

people which Christ has purified *to himself*, zealous of good works ; it is a selection made from all externally-constituted churches, not of persons following certain forms, but of those living holy lives and holding the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. The Church is Christ's body ; but Christ's body has no members but living members, and unless a visibly local Church could be found with all its members sound, (as was the case with the first Church at Jerusalem) no particular church can be called Christ's body. When Christ and the Apostles speak of the Church for which he died, they never point to any particular church, but they mean to include in that spiritual building, which they always speak of as one, all who are united to Christ by a living faith, although they may belong to various visible churches. If we be asked where that spiritual building, composed of faithful souls living to Christ and for his glory, is to be found, we answer that the Church in this sense is an object of faith, as that which is invisible ; we believe that such a body there is upon earth ; we believe in the Holy Catholic Church ; but if this were a church visible in some locality, as at Rome, or at Jerusalem, or at London, then were it not a matter of faith, but a matter of fact. No one says he believes in a Church at Rome, furnished with Bishops and Sacraments, and containing some thousands of baptized persons ; nor would any say he believes in a Church of New Zealand, with a Bishop at its head and several hundred native converts. These are matters of *fact* ; but the object of *faith* is, that in all these and all other churches, more or less corrupt, more or less perfect, there are certain faithful members whom Christ owns as belonging to *the* Church, which is His body, who are militant here on earth, but who will finally be among the general assembly and Church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven. This is the Holy Catholic Church, to which Mr. Sibthorp, we would hope, may yet belong, although he has endangered the welfare of his soul. We are aware that our ultra-Churchmen repudiate this term, ' Invisible Church ;' but Archbishop Secker uses it, and in the very sense we have here explained ; and we might justify the expression by a *catena patrum*, such as our modern divines delight to hang about our necks. The Church then for which Christ reigns and administers the government of the world, is that which we believe to be composed of all true believers, who shew by their lives and conversation that they have not received the grace of God in vain, and these are said to form the mystical body of Christ ; and he is not complete in his Mediatorial character if a single member be wanting. This Church is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all : other members of visible churches there may be who have been

baptized and catechized by a Priesthood, "in successive ordination," but they no more belong to the Church which is Catholic than Ananias and his wife belonged to the Church at Jerusalem.* The Holy Catholic Church, then, which such converts as the Spencers and the Sibthorps seek, is not *any* particular Church, nor all the visible Churches put together, except in essence, but is the blessed company of all *faithful* people; and to live without belonging to *this* is 'the grand mistake,' and not to live apart from the Church of Rome or the Church of England.

It is very probable, unless we state what our views of an Apostolic Church, as it is visibly constituted among us, are, that we shall be taken for certain low Churchmen, who consider all Ministers equally authorized, providing they preach the Gospel, or what we consider as such; and all churches equally safe, providing their members be good and godly; or, in other words, that "every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth." For the obviating all such unfavourable conclusions with regard to our orthodoxy, we shall particularize and describe the visible churches or communities, calling themselves such; and state how far our charity leads us to consider them as members of the same body. We take the definition of the visible Church (a congregation) and the lawfulness of ministering publicly, as contained in our Nineteenth and Twenty-Third Articles, to be agreeable to God's word written. And that wherever a Church fails in any of those things, it is either *corrupt*, or *false*, or *imperfect*. If a Church preserves the great and essential truths of the Gospel, such as they have been taught in all ages and in all places since the days of the Apostles, but at the same time adds other things to those truths, which are not found in God's word, but are rather repugnant to the same, that we call a *corrupt* Church—although the ministers may be called by proper authority, and although the Sacraments may be duly administered in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same; yet because the pure word of God is not preached, but is made vain by human traditions, or by any other spurious authority, we call

* "For lack of diligent observing the difference (so speaks the judicious Hooker) first, between the Church of God mystical and visible—then between the visible sound and corrupted, sometimes more sometimes less, the oversights are neither few nor slight that have been committed." Archbishop Wake, in his letter to Le Clerc, April, 1719, does not scruple to admit to Christian fellowship even those reformed Churches which have nothing in common with our form of discipline. "*Ecclesias reformatas etsi in aliquibus à nostrâ Anglicanâ dissentientes libenter amplector.*" He pleads indeed for the episcopal form as the best, and as that which has been received since the age of the Apostles, and wishes to see it prevail, as we do; and then adds (we quote the exact words, for the benefit of our modern divines and writers, without applying the epithet):—"Interim absit ut ego tam ferrei pectoris sim ut ob ejus modo defectum, aliquis earum a communione nostrâ abscindendus credam: aut cum *quibusdam* furiosis inter nos *Scriptoribus* nulla vera ac valida Sacramenta habere, adeoque vix Christianos esse pronuntiem unionem arctiorem inter omnes Reformatos procurare quovis pretio vellem."

such a Church a corrupt Church, and *it must be reformed*; if it hateth to be reformed, then its members are justified in separating from it, and seeking the pure word of God wherever they can find it. Such a Church is the Church of Rome, such another is the Church of Greece; and we may add, such are all the Oriental Churches at this moment. Again, if a Church calling itself National hath renounced the great and essential truths of the Gospel, denied the divinity of our Lord and Saviour, set aside the Catholic creeds and formularies, and interpreted the word of God according to its own imagination—such a Church, whatever else it may possess of order and discipline, is a false Church, and *must be subverted*. Such a Church is the present National Church of Geneva;—many of the so-called reformed consistorial Churches of France; and a great number of the Lutheran Churches; and in our own country those Unitarian or Socinian associations, which are organized with public teachers and public ordinances. Again, if a Church continues stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, teaching the pure word of God, showing to fallen man his need of an atoning sacrifice, setting forth the work and offices of the Spirit, and omitting no great and essential truth of the Gospel, but at the same time hath not the Sacraments duly administered, nor her ministers lawfully called to execute the same; or, which is the same thing, assumes an ecclesiastical authority which the Church universal never recognized, this we call an *imperfect* Church—and such a Church is the Church of Scotland, and those orthodox Presbyterian assemblies amongst ourselves, and these must be *improved*. There are then amongst the Churches that are visible, some *corrupt* that require to be reformed, some *imperfect* that require to be improved, and others so heretically *false* that they require to be subverted. Of these latter we shall say no more than to explain that by subversion we mean not that they should be persecuted or restrained by the secular arm; but that not having any foundation in Christ Jesus, the task of reforming or improving them is hopeless, and therefore the foundation must be laid again. In such Churches or Societies we expect to find none who belong to the mystical body of Christ, which is his Church invisible; we invite the members of such communities to come out from among them, and be separate, and touch not the unclean thing; and much as we deplore the apostate condition of those Churches which have defiled the faith and blighted the sinner's hope, yet we had rather have to deal with a corrupt than with a false Church; for in a corrupt Church, as the Apostle declares, *some shall be saved, yet so as by fire*. If, however, we should be called to decide between the corrupt and the imperfect Church—

that is, whether we prefer a legitimate ministry with corrupt doctrine, or pure doctrine with an unauthorized ministration—how could we for a moment hesitate, seeing that life eternal is, to know Jesus Christ and Him crucified, and not to belong to any particular form of Church government. With those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, whatever be the visible Church to which they belong, we can at least hold spiritual communion; but external communion we can only hold with such as are members of the same congregation, and acknowledge the same constituted authority. We can be joined and knit together in one communion, which is the communion of saints, with all those who hold the doctrines of the Gospel, although they may not adhere to our forms and discipline; and therefore whilst we call certain Churches imperfect, inasmuch as we find them not constituted according to Christ's appointment, yet do we verily believe that they furnish a good supply of living stones for that temple of Christ which is his body. Now although we are fully persuaded that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in the Church, viz. bishops, priests and deacons, and that therefore any departure from this order renders a Church imperfect,—yet we are far from holding with certain fanatics of our day, that there is no such thing as a Church without this form of discipline; nor have our strictest Churchmen ever held any such an opinion. "Episcopal divines," says Archbishop Bramhall, "will readily subscribe to the determination of the learned Bishop of Winchester in his answer to the second Epistle of Molinus. "Nevertheless, if our form of episcopacy be of divine right, it doth not follow from thence that there is not salvation without it, or that a Church cannot consist without it. He is blind who does not see Churches consisting without it; he is hard-hearted who denieth them salvation;—we are none of those hard-hearted persons; we put a great difference between these things: there may be something absent in the exterior regimen which is of divine right, and yet salvation to be had." And this is what we designate an imperfect, but not a false Church. It is necessary to distinguish between the true nature and essence of a Church, and the integrity or perfection of a Church. The true nature of a Church consists in the pure word of God being preached, and the sacraments duly administered. Where these are, we acknowledge that it is a visible Church; but the *integrity* of a Church consists further in that apostolic form, and in those ancient creeds and formularies, which can be traced back to the age of the Apostles without interruption. We value this successional order of men, and think it a great privilege that we have our ministers thus lawfully called and sent by those who

derive their authority from Christ. We consider that if we preach the pure word of God, and rightly and duly administer his sacraments, that we have a visible Church in its integrity; and we need not, under these circumstances, wait, as others must do, to see whether or not God will give his blessing. We try no experiments, but we have the promise beforehand that he will be with a Church so constituted to the end of the world. But the mistake is in considering a Church so constituted, in which there may be a majority of unconverted, as *the* Church which Christ has purchased, and holding up this framework of a true visible Church as the body of Christ: whereas it is only the ordained means by which members outwardly admitted become members of the mystical body. The mistake is in insisting upon this Church being the only means of salvation which God will own; comparing it to Noah's Ark and to the ancient Church of the Jews, and to the ship in which alone Christ is; whereas all these comparisons only relate to the spiritual body of Christ, wherein all his true followers are united. The ark is Christ, the ship is Christ, the rock is Christ. But there are many ways which God may have permitted, and by which we may get safe into the ark, or the ship, or obtain firm standing upon the rock. Upon these principles we think we can be good Churchmen whilst we are charitable towards others, and can remain in communion with a reformed Church with a quiet conscience. We too would live for the Church; that is, for the advancement of that kingdom which Christ came to establish upon earth; we too would contend for a principle "which will include all other lower principles, and be a main-spring of life," but that we hold to be the love of God, and of all mankind for his sake; for love is the fulfilling of the law. We too would maintain the discipline of our own beloved Church as being the best, but not as being the *only* form of Church government which gives validity to ordinances; and with such views, we cannot but think that our minds are as easy as those of our erring brethren can be who have taken refuge in a Church which excludes from the pale of salvation all who (except through invincible ignorance) hold not communion with her; nor can we be persuaded that our hopes of joining the Church triumphant are less bright, or our joys less sacred because we are ready to say with an apostle, "Peace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF ST. IRENÆUS. By JAMES BEAVEN, M.A., St. Edmund Hall, Oxon, and Curate of Leigh. 8vo. London: *Rivingtons*. 1841.

THIS work is very similar in its nature to the well-known treatises of Bishop Kaye upon Tertullian and Clement, which the author seems to have taken for his model. Its purpose is to give a succinct account of the life of Irenæus, and the leading features of doctrine which his writings present to our view.

St. Irenæus is one of the most attractive characters among the Fathers of the early Church. Whether we consider his connexion with Polycarp, and through him with the beloved Apostle St. John, or the Christian simplicity of faith, and unfeigned holiness of spirit which breathes in his works, or the character of peace-maker which he filled, in happy accordance with his name, in the quartodeciman controversy, his character seems insphered in a peculiar atmosphere of grace and beauty. Mr. Beaven, too, has executed his task with creditable industry and care. We cannot indeed agree fully with all his doctrinal views, nor perhaps concur in the relative importance which he attaches to the discipline of the early Church. But still he is, generally speaking, temperate in his views, free from that patristic idolatry which is so painfully conspicuous in some students of the Fathers, and of which a glaring instance was before our readers lately in the life of Cyprian; and disposed to claim for their writings only that moderate authority which is shared by faithful teachers of Divine truth in every age.

With all these causes to secure our interest, we confess that our feeling, after the perusal, partakes both of weariness and disappointment. Can it be, we are ready to ask, that this is the whole of the practical instruction and theological wisdom which one of the most amiable and excellent of the Fathers can afford us? Are *these* the treasures for which one large class of writers would beguile away the Church from the direct study of the oracles of God; and to which others, more temperate and sound in the faith, would refer us as, at least, needful witnesses to assure us of the sense of Scripture on all the great points of doctrine? Is it needful to discover the Greek word of which *convenire* is the version, and to determine whether it means *to come together*, or *to agree*, before we can decide that the claims of the Roman Church are a proud and unscriptural usurpation? Or can it be needful to prove that the word *advocate* may be used, and is used, figuratively, in order to be convinced that the worship of the virgin as practised in that Church, and recommended by her popes, is a direct apos-

tasy from Christ and a flagrant insult offered to the majesty of heaven ?

We are far from wishing to discourage the study of Church history, and by no means deny a measure of importance to the testimony of the early writers, and that valuable instruction may be gained from their works. But still the aspect of the times convinces us more and more that warning is chiefly needed in the opposite direction. The stream of doctrine seems now to be setting fast into the shallows and quicksands of human authority and ceremonial details ; and the broad and safe ocean of Scripture theology to be in danger of neglect, from the loud call for studies more high-sounding and ostentatious, but far less productive of spiritual benefit, and fraught with no small danger to the inexperienced and incautious student.

Let us view the subject for a few moments in its practical aspect. The Church, in her ordination-service, wisely directs the clergy, "by daily reading and weighing of the scriptures," to "wax riper and stronger in their ministry." She admonishes them that in no other way can they compass the work of their high office, than by "doctrine and exhortation taken out of the holy scriptures, and a life agreeable to the same." In the light of this wise and faithful direction, let us enquire to what extent it can be safe or wise for the teachers of the Church to divert their studies from the scriptures themselves, to the secondary streamlets of ecclesiastical authors.

And first, it is clear that the reading and study of the Fathers, when kept strictly subordinate, and pursued as one means of gaining fuller insight into the interpretation of God's word, is quite consistent with these admonitions of our Church. But then, for this end, it must be *really* subordinate, and joined with a direct search and study of the scriptures in all their scope and fulness, comparing spiritual things with spiritual, with earnest prayer for the enlightening grace and heavenly unction of the Holy Spirit of God. Under such safeguards, and when carried on in this spirit, the study of the Fathers, like any other study, may yield its modicum of help towards the full knowledge of scriptural and saving truth. But this admission being made once and for all, we return to our first enquiry. And here surely there are many convincing reasons to deter us from that excessive devotion to patristic research which is now coming into vogue : and to impress on every Christian, and eminently on every clergyman, the supreme importance of a direct, full, close, and persevering study of the pure word of God.

What then are the real facts to be considered in deciding this practical inquiry ? They are simple, and deeply impressive.

In the first place, we have before us the visible Church, in its

widest extent comprising more than a hundred millions of souls. A hundred millions of immortal souls ! travelling rapidly through the hand-breath of three-score years and ten, to an irrevocable eternity. In a few years one half of their number will have returned to the dust, their state for eternity being unchangeably sealed. In this short space of a few years, the power of divine truth has to be brought to bear upon the most hidden recesses of their hearts. The great work of repentance, conversion, faith, and holiness, has to be accomplished. The blood of the eternal Son of God has to be applied to their conscience, and his holy image, by the Spirit of God, to be stamped and engraven on their soul. Wherever this work is neglected, there is nothing but a fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation ; wherever it is accomplished, there is the sure promise of eternal glory.

In the next place, we have the messages of God himself, given to the Church from time to time, through the long space of four thousand years. In these sacred oracles all is pure and unmingled truth, the provision of Infinite Wisdom and unwearied Love. They are all adapted to the wants of the soul. God himself has fixed on them the stamp of his own Divine all-sufficiency. They are able to make us wise unto salvation. They can make the man of God perfect. They have power to furnish us thoroughly for every good work. They are all plain to him that understandeth. They are compared to silver tried in the fire, and to fine gold. They are suited with a Divine wisdom to the various states and wants of the Church. They are stored with the deepest treasures of truth, which the longest research can never fully explore, and the most patient and prayerful student will find ever opening before him in a growing fulness of celestial beauty. And yet so simple are they that the plainest may understand them ; so accessible as to be within the reach of the poorest Christian ; so thrilling in their interest, so rich in the language of human tenderness, and in the wonders of Divine power, as to attract the simplest hearts, when not seared and blinded by the obstinate love of sin. Months are needed to give us even a general knowledge of their contents, and to fix on our memories the grand outlines of their sacred instructions. But to fill up those outlines with the full landscape in all its fair proportions, life itself is far too short, and perhaps even eternity itself will scarcely serve to exhaust their mysterious treasures of saving wisdom.

Let us simply keep in view these two facts, and we may safely put the question to every reasonable mind—Is it not madness and folly for the commissioned heralds of the gospel to divert a large proportion of their time and thoughts from this divine fountain-head

of truth, to the scanty streams or rivulets, muddy with human errors and traditions, which are to be found even in the Fathers of the Church? Must it not bring a withering blight over the spiritual atmosphere of the soul, when the word of God is thus practically superseded, and the writings of man come to fill that place, in our intellectual vision, which ought to be reserved for the clear beams of the Sun of Righteousness, shining in his own inspired messages of love, and for the broad landscape of truth in the unerring oracles of God? For ourselves, we cannot read even the better works of this class, and those which, like the one before us, are free from the more gross infection of Popish tendencies and superstitious formalism—without a feeling of sandy barrenness, and a double recoil of spirit to the green pastures and living waters which are ever fresh and flowing in the pages of Holy Writ. We feel disposed to remind their authors, judicious and estimable though they may be, that there is yet a more excellent way; and that while on their present field of research, their time and thoughts are spent, we could almost say, “*laboriose nihil agendo*,” there is a neglected field of research which would repay the most patient tillage a thousandfold; and a mine where truth is stored in far more rich abundance than in all the writings of man; and that if they would apply their toil and labour here, they would reap a tenfold blessing themselves, and be the honoured instruments of far more deep and lasting benefits to the whole Church of God.

Let us apply these remarks to the case before us. One chapter of the present work is devoted to the sentiments of Irenæus on unfulfilled prophecy, Antichrist, and the Millennium. With many of the sentiments held by this holy man on these points we certainly agree, and believe him to be more scripturally just and sound in his statements than many later writers. But at the same time we are persuaded that a far more full, deep, and instructive acquaintance with this subject will be gained by the direct study of Scripture than the statements of our Author can supply. To use as a figure that statement which has brought on his memory no little undeserved reproach, we seem, in his pages, to meet with a few solitary grapes, instead of those rich and fruitful clusters of sacred and holy promise, which the word of God itself presents to the Church, in the glories of Christ’s approaching kingdom. The prophecies of Daniel, Isaiah, and the Apocalypse, read with seriousness, attention and prayer, and repeatedly compared with each other, will be a far more effectual means than the perusal of Irenæus and his commentators, of obtaining both a distinct assurance and a lively impression, of the joyful truths connected with the millennial blessedness of the Church, and the future advent of our divine Saviour.

While, therefore, we can recommend Mr. Beaven's work to our readers as a correct summary of the opinions of Irenæus, and in many respects an useful manual of reference, we feel bound to caution them against a spiritual taste formed upon such models. In the place of that excessive veneration for the Fathers which some are aiming to restore, let us hold fast the simplicity of our faith in the sufficiency of the word of God, and search the Scriptures with increasing earnestness for their inexhaustible treasures of divine truth. Thus, and thus only, shall we attain that supreme delight in the weightier matters of the law and the gospel, which is the best safeguard of sound doctrine, the surest test of spiritual vitality, and the pledge of lasting progress in true holiness and heavenly wisdom.

THE LIFE AND PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY THE SEVENTH. By JOHN WILLIAM BOWDEN, M.A. In 2 vols. 8vo. London: *Rivingtons*. 1841.

THE history of literature, like that of nations, presents many anomalies to the eye of the observer. Books of undoubted merit have often failed of becoming popular during the age in which they have appeared; and it has been left to future generations to erect a monument over the tomb of the neglected poet or the unappreciated moralist. The wreath of posthumous fame has often been awarded to writers, who were unable to procure, during life, the poor pittance that was necessary for their bare support; while on the other hand the judgment of posterity has as frequently reversed the sentence of contemporary readers, and has condemned works, which met with general acceptance, to late, but nevertheless to merited oblivion. Why is this? What are the principles that govern the changeful tide of popularity? What are the laws by which it is regulated, and in obedience to which it ebbs and flows? One of them, at least, and that one in our opinion the most important, must be looked for in the ever varying state of moral and intellectual feeling. The sublime poems of Milton were unpopular at their first appearance, because they were in advance of the age in which they were composed; the poems of his contemporary Waller are unpopular now, because the present age is incomparably in advance of them. It seems then but reasonable to expect, that any book, which addresses itself to the moral feeling of a large class of the community, which asserts the principles which they

assert, and advocates the views to which they are attached, will gain at least a certain amount of popularity for its author ; and that faults in style and execution, which under other circumstances would overwhelm him with censure, will be overlooked for the moment by those who think as he thinks, and who gather around their advocate under the influence of party spirit, not to criticise, but to praise ; not to judge, but to applaud. We know no other principle on which to account for the sudden and short-lived popularity, which has often attached to works of the most insignificant character—to works of which the reputation has resembled the premature growth of some sickly exotic, forced forward into an unnatural maturity, and withering almost before its blossoms are unfolded.

These remarks are intended to apply in their full force to the volumes of Mr. Bowden. We acknowledge his extensive acquaintance with ecclesiastical history. We are most ready to award to him all the praise, which is due to industrious research ; but industry is not the only qualification required in an author who undertakes to treat of one of the most important epochs of history ; and in the work of Mr. Bowden we have looked in vain for the slightest trace of any other. We have read his "Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh," without pleasure and without profit. The style is un-English, tortuous, and inverted, as though the words had dropped into their places by accident, or had been appointed to them by lot ; his views are crude and undigested ; his principles such, that we can only say, we trust that we have little in common with them ; and were it not that those principles are held by a numerous class of persons, and that their advocacy by Mr. Bowden may probably win for him a fictitious and short-lived popularity, "The Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh," might have gone down unnoticed by us to the tomb of all the Capulets, and have been added, as it most assuredly will be, to the long list of forgotten biographies.

We have said that Mr. Bowden's style is un-English, tortuous, and inverted. This is the least important, perhaps, of the charges which we have brought against him, but it is not one to be altogether slighted. The graces of style may be occasionally dispensed with in works of acknowledged and transcendent merit. The diamond is precious even though it be unpolished. But the pebble that has been picked up upon the shore derives all its value from the art of the lapidary, and we cannot forgive the blemishes, which have resulted from his neglect or unskilfulness. We know no reason why historians of the present day should be excused from aiming at that easy correctness, which is conspicuous in the

pages of Hume and Robertson; unless it be perhaps on the ground, that they write for the bookseller, and not for immortality. When this is the case, the excuse should be stated in the preface in some such form as this, "No time for correction, the book being paid for in advance at — per sheet;" so that, at least, we may know what we are to expect. We presume Mr. Bowden does not write for the bookseller in this sense, and therefore it is the more unpardonable in him to have given to the public such a sentence as the following:—"And while thus becoming dominant in episcopal elections, the monarchs naturally exerted with still less of scruple their arbitrary power in cases of nomination to the rich abbeys, which through the liberality exercised or encouraged by their race were now rising to importance in their dominions: cases in which ancient usage and canon law were less directly opposed to their authoritative intervention." But we may open Mr. Bowden's book almost at random, and be assured that before we have read a page we shall meet with some violation of the principles of the English language. We cite a few passages:—"But enactments like these, impaired as had become the constitution of the western Church, and crippled as were her proper and essential powers, seem rather to have been put forth as protests against the advance of corruption, than with any sanguine expectation of materially interfering with its general progress." "As in the success of his cause had become involved a practical illustration of their leading principle." "And this being the case, the sovereign was of all men the least likely to open his eyes to the evils probable in future to result from an undue exertion, in this direction, of the regal prerogative." "Though in the miserable circumstances under which they severally came, at subsequent periods, to their ends, men deemed that they could recognize the less easily averted chastisements of a higher tribunal." "Thus invested in St. Angelo, Gregory continued for about six weeks." "But that curtailment of these lessons, which, by the present system, is recognized, was a practice generally introduced in the time of Gregory's successors." Surely in all these instances it must have been chance that determined the position of the words, and placed them in an order* so tortuous and inverted! We scarcely seem to be reading English. We almost doubt the identity of our native language.

We have not room for more extracts. Suffice it to say, that we have not found in Mr. Bowden's two volumes a single energetic or

* We have used the word "*order*" upon the authority of Milton's justly celebrated lines—

"The other *shape*,
If *shape* it might be called, which *shape* had none."

graceful sentence, and that we have often paused from sheer fatigue amid the mazy labyrinths of his interminable periods.

We pass to the consideration of the views which Mr. Bowden's book developes. We have called them crude and undigested. Indeed the main position which he endeavours to establish is one which appears to us so monstrous, that we can only wonder at the moral blindness, which has failed of detecting a self-evident fallacy. Mr. Bowden would have us acknowledge a deep debt of gratitude to Pope Gregory the Seventh, for what he calls "the reformation of the eleventh century," i. e., for establishing the papal system in Europe; for destroying the independence of every National Church; for usurping the authority of every Bishop in Christendom; and for breaking down every barrier which yet protected the liberties of mankind, against the most fearful spiritual tyranny that ever existed. He makes a bold demand upon us. Surely he must have some weighty reasons by which to enforce his arguments. Let us hear him then. Why, he tells us, not once only but repeatedly, that the episcopal power, which Gregory annihilated, was a divine institution. Consequently, on the author's own shewing, we are to thank Gregory, in the first place, for setting aside the ordinance of God. But again he assures us, that every step which Gregory took rendered a counter revolution, at some future time, which should undo his work, more certain and inevitable. This is strange reasoning. We had supposed—we were doubtless mistaken—that the *reductio ad absurdum* in mathematics was a good argument, and that by a similar process in morals we arrived legitimately at the conclusion, that that which necessarily leads to evil is itself evil. According to our author's shewing the very reverse is the case. That which necessarily leads to evil is itself good—good, for the introduction and establishment of which the Church of England and Christendom in general ought to reverence the pious memory of Pope Gregory the Seventh. These are Mr. Bowden's views on the important subject "of the reformation of the eleventh century" (the term is not ours, but his). Are we wrong in calling them crude and undigested? We do not wish to be uncourteous, but we feel that we are not at liberty to make use of milder language.

But the most important part of our subject remains to be considered. We have to speak of the principles which pervade Mr. Bowden's book. We trust, we said, that we have little in common with them. Our readers must permit us to express a similar hope on their behalf. With regard to his principles Mr. Bowden shall speak for himself. We extract the following passage from the thirteenth and fourteenth pages of the introduction to his work:—

“ But could we suppose the high-minded pontiff of the eleventh century to contemplate, with the feelings of his own time, the religious notions and practices of ours, what might he not think of the almost total abandonment of the Christian duty of fasting? What of the almost universal neglect, for six days out of every seven, of public worship, in all former ages recognised as a daily duty? What of the contempt shown to the Church's authority, as well by the non-observance of her solemn seasons of humiliation or rejoicing, as by the formation of a host of irregular religious societies half within and half without her pale? or what of the tenet, now notoriously prevalent among us, that those whom the Church has duly admitted to holy baptism, may not trust that they were therein admitted to the grace of regeneration; but that persons who, after the reception of that holy sacrament, have abandoned themselves to the grossest sin, have reason to hope for a subsequent admission to the fulness of that spiritual blessing? The age of Gregory VII. cannot, assuredly, be charged with generally sanctioning or approving any corruptions of doctrine or of practice more opposed than these to the teaching of the Church Catholic, or to the testimony of Scripture.”

Is it possible that a Protestant minister, a clergyman of the Church of England should have written this? We grieve, bitterly grieve over a fact which cannot be gainsaid. But to what does his assertion amount? To this—that the worship of images, to cite one of the corruptions of doctrine which Gregory himself most strenuously upheld, stands on the same level with “ the contempt shown to the Church's authority, as well by the non-observance of her solemn seasons of humiliation or rejoicing, as by the formation of a host of irregular religious societies, half-within and half-without her pale,” i. e., in plain language, with the non-observance of Saints'-days and the support of the Bible Society. We start at the exhibition of spiritual ignorance which stands prominently out in this fearful passage. Are we indeed come to this, that a Christian man,—nay more, a minister of Christ, can dare to institute a comparison between the authority which promulgated the second commandment, and that which has ordained the observance of Saints'-days? Has he forgotten who it was that decided this same question, when it was agitated by the Scribes and Pharisees eighteen hundred years ago? or does he disregard the solemn verdict of the Saviour, “ Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” Fain would we drop our mantle over our brother's shame; if it were not that we feel it our bounden duty to stamp our strongest censure upon such monstrous principles, and to warn our readers against the book that inculcates them. We will only bid Mr. Bowden, in conclusion, to beware, lest in sinning against the brethren he sin against Christ. For man to stand up in judgment against his fellows, and to exclude them from the pale of the Church on account of their difference from himself in non-essentials, while they exhibit scriptural evidence of their union with Jesus Christ, “ in whom neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumci-

sion, but a new creature," this is guilt which indeed partakes of the very essence of popery. Mr. Bowden's statement, "that persons who, after the reception of that holy sacrament (baptism) have abandoned themselves to the grossest sin, have no reason to hope for a subsequent admission to the fulness of that spiritual blessing" (the grace of regeneration,) appears to us as contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England, as it undoubtedly is to that of the Bible. The Church of England evidently intending to guard against this very error, which Mr. Bowden promulgates, has recorded her opinion in the most precise and definite language. The sixteenth article, "Of Sin after Baptism," runs thus:—"Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable; wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives." When Mr. Bowden speaks of persons "half-within and half-without the pale of the Church," does he intend the expression to apply to those, who have subscribed her articles without believing them, and have given to them their solemn assent under a mental reservation? If so, we would remind him that the poor evasion, *ἡ γλῶσσο' ομωμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρεν' ἀνωμοτος*, was condemned even by an Athenian public, and was accounted too grossly immoral, to be admitted into the code of heathen morality. But the error of Mr. Bowden is condemned by the testimony of scripture, as expressly as it is by the authoritative formularies of the Church. "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin," is the doctrine which Scripture teaches. "No," says our author, "not from sin committed after baptism." Mr. Bowden speaks (page 25) of "the abstract right to veneration possessed by the see, which had been founded and originally governed by St. Peter." This is strange language from a Protestant. Again (page 29) he says, "It is not for us to seek to pare away expressions, or to reduce to their minimum of meaning the glowing testimonies of antiquity to that mother's (Rome's) purity and honour." The purity and honour of Rome! called in Scripture, "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." Mr. Bowden must pardon us for believing the testimony of God in preference to his. We had noted in Mr. Bowden's two volumes little short of a hundred passages to the full as objectionable as those which we have already brought forward. But it is useless to multiply quotations. We have adduced sufficient evidence to prove, that his doctrinal views are utterly unsound, whether they be tried by the test of Scripture, or by the Articles of the Church

of England, her accredited and authoritative formularies; and have made good our assertion, that the principles which pervade his book are most injurious in their tendency, and most worthy of all censure. If, indeed, as we strongly suspect, he intended that book to be "a heavy blow and discouragement to Protestantism," we cannot congratulate him upon his success; but we are free to admit, that his failure has arisen, not from any deficiency of zeal but from sheer weakness of execution—"Inceptus clamor frustratus hiantem."

We have yet another charge to bring against Mr. Bowden, that of general unfairness and misrepresentation. His pen is that of an advocate rather than a historian. His object is to extol Gregory the Seventh, and the change which he effected in the condition of the Church: and, like a true partisan, he sees everything through the false medium of inveterate prejudice. Does any contemporary writer take a different view? He is immediately set down as a creature of the Emperor. But it is never hinted that the papacy may have had its creatures too; and that the conflicting statements of both parties must be viewed with the same suspicion and distrust. Once more we will avail ourselves of Mr. Bowden's own evidence, to establish our charge of general unfairness and misrepresentation. How does he treat the insolent interference of Gregory the Fifth, in the matter of the marriage of King Robert of France with Bertha, daughter of Conrad King of Burgundy? Robert and Bertha were very distantly related; but to make up the measure of an uncanonical union, the Pope found it necessary to take further into account, that "Robert had contracted what the Church considered a spiritual relationship with Bertha, by having undertaken the office of godfather to one of her children by her former husband." On this ground Gregory dissolved the union, and commanded the parties to separate from each other! A more atrocious act of tyranny can hardly be conceived. It is difficult to assign for it any other motive, than a determination, on the part of its author, to let slip no opportunity of aggrandizing the papal power. But it was the act of a Pope: and Mr. Bowden glosses it over with the phrase—"Incensed by this gross violation of ecclesiastical discipline, Gregory," &c. We will take another instance. The Bible has set down "forbidding to marry" as one of the marks of Antichrist. But Mr. Bowden seems to have transferred to Rome that well-known principle of English law, "The King can do no wrong." With him it is the Pope that can do no wrong, and therefore he not only excuses the prohibition of clerical marriages, but absolutely lauds it. "The battle," he says, "which they undertook against their less strict contemporaries

was unquestionably that of purity against impurity, of holiness against corruption." And presently after—"The priest who had habituated himself to trample upon one precept, bearing the impress of the Church's authority, had passed the great moral barrier which separates the systematically, though imperfectly, dutiful, from the habitually godless and profane: the consistency of his character was marred; and his progress to the worst excesses of vice was, perhaps, accomplished by an easier transition than had been his first bold step from obedience to its opposite." This "Church authority," exercised for so unholy and unscriptural a purpose, is an authority to which we take it that St. Paul "would have given place by subjection—no not for an hour." Ever after our Author considers himself at liberty to designate all married priests by some such epithet as "profane," "licentious," or "debauched." Thus, in describing the outbreak which took place at Mantua, on the promulgation of the canons of celibacy in that city by Pope Leo, he says, "Further measures against *clerical licentiousness* were taken by him in a council at Rome in 1051. And in 1052, summoning a council at Mantua, he attempted to carry the strictness of his reforms into northern Italy. But the populace, incited by the *lax and corrupt* clergy of the place, assailed his domestics while they waited at the door of the church in which the assembly was convened," &c. Who would suppose, unless he were previously acquainted with the strong party-bias of the Author, that the term "clerical licentiousness" simply implied a determination not to succumb to the usurped authority of Rome—not to admit a gross violation of Christian liberty, expressly denounced in Scripture as a mark of apostacy from the faith? and that the epithets "lax and corrupt" were used to designate those clergymen who, with St. Paul, boldly maintained their right "to lead about a sister a wife" (i. e. a wife, provided she were a Christian woman), and who resisted the cold, calculating, self-interested attempts of a tyrannous and anti-christian power, to introduce into the Church canons of celibacy denounced alike by the God of nature and the God of revelation? For ourselves, called to the ministry of a reformed and Protestant Church, we blush not to confess to the sin of matrimony—we envy not Mr. Bowden his Romish predilections; but we can well imagine that Rome is already hailing in expectation her half-recovered son, and addressing him in impatience of his yet delayed return, "Cum talis sis utinam noster esses." Mr. Bowden's language in describing the conduct of the papal legates at Constantinople, A. D. 1054, implies no censure, expresses no disgust; although perhaps it would be difficult to find, even in the annals

of Rome herself, a more gross abuse of apostolic precedent than that of which they were guilty, in shaking off the dust of their feet against the city, because its patriarch refused to admit the supremacy of the Roman pontiff—although this rash and insolent act was the immediate cause of that lamentable schism which still divides the Eastern and the Western Churches. It is Mr. Bowden's business, as the advocate of the papacy, to shift the blame from them and lay it upon other parties. Prejudice is a hard taskmaster, and Mr. Bowden has found it so in the present instance. The truth of history has obliged him to narrate the sentence of excommunication laid by the Romish legates upon the altar of St. Sophia, and the still more outrageous grossness of their subsequent conduct. Their defence was found to be impracticable, and the Author's apology expires amid unmeaning generalities. At page 218 Mr. Bowden paraphrases or translates "Clerici uxorati" "the lax and simoniacal party in the Church!" This is really outrageous. We must apologise to our readers for adding another word in proof of that unfairness and misrepresentation with which we have charged him: but we cannot help remarking, that we were little prepared, either for the censure implied on Harold, who "*neglected*" to lay his claim to the throne of England before the apostolic chair; or for the eulogium passed, on the authority of William of Malmesbury, upon the religious character of the Norman conquerors of England. We are not inclined to admit, that it is the province of a Christian Bishop to dispose of kingdoms; or that religion consists in the founding of monasteries, or in the saying of masses for the souls of the departed. Again, the crime of plotting against an unpopular abbot does not seem to us quite to justify their superior in putting out the eyes or cutting out the tongues of the offenders. But Gregory the Seventh could do no wrong, and Mr. Bowden absolutely apologises for the sanction which he gave to these cruel punishments. It is painful to pursue the subject further. But we must cite the praise that is lavished upon Gregory's suppression of the Gothic ritual in Spain, which had been in use there for centuries, and was universally intelligible; and the substitution of the Romish book of ceremonies, veiled from common eyes under the mystery of a dead language—the account that is given of Gregory's correspondence with the traitor Rudolph—of his endeavours to set the sons of Henry in unnatural rebellion against their father—of the excommunication pronounced by him upon his legitimate Sovereign, and blasphemously assumed by him to be the judgment of the Holy Ghost; and of the excommunication of Nicephorus Botoniates, called forth, as Mr. Bowden admits,

“by the voice of private friendship;”—certainly a most worthy motive! And we must enquire whether the historian, who could make these acts the subjects of praise instead of blame, of eulogium instead of censure, can be regarded in any other light than that of a determined and uncompromising advocate? We pass by the simplicity that could see in the crosier “the antitype of that rod, which in the hand of Moses had brought water from the rock to the relief of a perishing people; and in the ring of investiture, the seal of a pure faith and the impress of the truth.” Mr. Bowden is welcome, if it please him, to behold in these symbols “an awful significancy.”—“The toys of children satisfy the child.” Those whose minds are full-grown will only laugh. But it is no laughing matter that he has dared to compare Gregory’s enforcement of clerical celibacy, in direct violation of the command of God, with the reform instituted by Ezra in strict obedience to divine authority. It is no laughing matter that he actually censures Berengarius for impugning the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation; or that he declares his own opinion respecting “the sacred doctrine of the real presence and the awful mysteriousness of the holy sacrament,” in a manner which appears to us to savour more of popery, than of a strict adherence to the article of the Church of England, which treats of this subject.

We have done with this most ill-written and objectionable book, not because we find it difficult to bring forward other proofs of gross unfairness and partiality; or because the dangerous principles of its Author might not be yet more fully exposed; but because we trust that we have said enough. It is worth while to enquire in conclusion, what could have been Mr. Bowden’s real object in giving to the world his history “of the Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh.”

Did he indeed intend to clear the character of Gregory from every aspersion, to establish his fame as a reformer, and to raise a monument to his memory? If so, he has singularly failed: for looking to the main facts which he has been obliged to detail, and stripping off the false colours under which he has endeavoured to disguise them, we can only see in this Pontiff a bold, bad man—a traitor to his lawful Sovereign, and a companion of traitors—an encourager of civil war and domestic broils—an assertor of heretical doctrines and antichristian principles—a subverter of the faith once delivered to the saints—a main establisher of the papal system, with all its corruptions and all its tyranny, in countries yet comparatively unsubjected to the iron despotism of Rome—a man undoubtedly possessed of extraordinary talents, but who exerted them only for the most mischievous purposes—who suf-

ferred himself to be diverted from his objects by no remorse, no compunctions, no sympathy with human suffering—who carried out to the full, in his own conduct, the creed afterwards professed by the Jesuits, that the end justifies the means; and who at last deservedly perished in the conflagration which his own pride and ambition had excited. Such, on the shewing of those facts which Mr. Bowden details, is our estimate of the character of Gregory the Seventh. What, then, we again ask, could have been Mr. Bowden's real object in giving his history to the world? We will venture to hazard a conjecture. He intended, under cover of "the reformation of the eleventh century," to attack the system now existing in England, under which the state appoints to the highest ecclesiastical dignities, and exercises a control over the Church in general. He would fain see the Church emancipated from this bondage. He desires that it should be self-governed. Hence his eulogiums on Gregory the Seventh, who did indeed liberate the Church from the thralldom under which it was held by the German Emperors—but only to trample its liberties under his own feet, and to rivet round its neck the more intolerable yoke of papal tyranny. The self-government of the Church is an object, which we too have at heart, and for which we could be content to suffer much. But then we mean by the Church, neither Pope, nor Archbishop, nor Bishops, no, nor even the clergy, but the whole body of communicants. This body we sincerely wish to see freed from every yoke, self-governed, pure alike in creed and practice, and vigorous in discipline. But the reformation of the nineteenth century, to ensure our approval, must be thus comprehensive in its object. It must be brought about by far other means than those employed by Gregory the Seventh. Its arms must be such as the Church can legitimately wield—such as it did wield in apostolic times—patient endurance for Christ's sake, and a fixed determination to suffer, if need be, rather than consent to a compromise of principle. Resistance to lawfully-constituted authority, rebellion against the civil power, war and blood-shedding, and the absolution of subjects from their allegiance—these, in our opinion, are the proper weapons of Antichrist, and we wonder not, therefore, that Gregory employed them. Finally, if the Church seek to be self-governed, it must leave the state to be self-governed too; it must not aim at usurping secular power, or thrusting itself into the administration of secular affairs. If the reformation of the nineteenth century be conducted on these principles, we shall rejoice to co-operate in bringing it about; and we shall rejoice not the less, because, under such circumstances, it can have nothing in common with the reformation effected by Gregory the Seventh.

A CHARGE, *delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester, at the Visitation in June and September, 1841.* By the Right Reverend JOHN BIRD, Lord Bishop of Chester. London: Hatchard. 1841.

A CHARGE, *delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, at the Visitation in August and September, 1841.* By the Right Reverend JAMES HENRY, Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Published at the request of the Clergy. London: Rivington. 1841.

It is generally admitted to be a point of critical etiquette—at least among reviewers professing the principles of the Church of England—to refrain from all comment upon the literary merits or demerits of Episcopal Charges. The writers are presumed to be beyond the censure, or above the praise, of ordinary men. How far this mode of procedure may be equitable towards others, or advantageous to the Authors themselves, might perhaps admit of question—it is a question, however, which *we* at least decline to agitate. Where, as in the present instance, two (or more) charges are grouped together as the material of a single article, comparison would be invidious; and might, after all, lead to an incorrect conclusion, as the production, which exhibited most of the excellency of man's speech and wisdom, might be least imbued with the savour of the oracles of God—least pervaded by the influences of the Spirit of Truth. We gladly avail ourselves, therefore, of the established rule, not only for the present, but for every future occasion; and we do this the more readily, because the Episcopal Authors now before us have long since established a high reputation in other branches of literature, and it could not be imagined for an instant that the ecclesiastical dignity of either Prelate needed to be interposed as a buckler between him and the ordeal of candid criticism. We are only anxious to have it understood, once for all, that in passing, *sub silentio*, certain equivocal or ambiguous expressions in an episcopal charge, we are not to be considered as wanting in our duty, or deficient in that observation which alone could justify us in attempting the task which we have spontaneously assumed. We desire to be equally distinct from those who regard episcopacy with rude irreverence, and delight to insist on the individual fallibility of Bishops; and those who seem to think that there is so potent a charm in the title of Right Reverend, or in the ceremonial of consecration by which it is conferred, that he who, as a Presbyter, did nothing that was right, shall be taken, as a Prelate, to do nothing that

is wrong. What we *might* hold if it were considered an indispensable qualification for the Episcopal office that he who is advanced thereunto should have used the office of a Presbyter well, and purchased to himself a good degree, and great boldness in the faith of Christ Jesus, is beside our present purpose. We have no hesitation, however, in stating our belief that if there be not probation before, there must be probation after, the Episcopate; and that swayed as the disposal of the mitre too often is by considerations purely political—it makes some difference, even in the critical analysis and judgment of a Charge, whether it proceeds from a Bishop of the State, or a Bishop of the Church—one who has passed through every degree of the ministry, and adorned every office through which he past, or one whose name was never heard until it was published in the Gazette, and concerning whom, when men ask, “Who is the new Bishop,” no better answer can be returned, than, “The Brother of Lord A——, or the near relation of the Member for ——.” In such cases, indeed, the Church has again and again had reason to acknowledge, that the Providence of God has given an Apostle to the College of Bishops, where the policy of man designed only an unscrupulous vote in the House of Peers. Of the views and spirit of the newly-created Prelate we can ordinarily form an accurate estimate from his Primary Charge. If this be conversant only about questions of civil or ecclesiastical polity, formal directions for duty, or vague generalities of doctrine—avoiding, with scrupulous exactness, all declaration of the “mind of the Bishop” on the very points where it was most important to be known, we can only exclaim, Alas for the Church! Happily, neither of the Charges before us is a Primary Charge, or we could not have hazarded this remark—but neither Prelate is a novice in the Episcopate;—and with regard to the Author of the Charge which heads our list, an Episcopate of thirteen years has established a title to the gratitude of the diocese and the veneration of the Church, which will be better understood when the present generation shall have passed away, and the monument of Bishop Sumner shall be found not only in the memory of his virtues, but in the work of his hands.

We had always believed that our own Diocesan, the Bishop of London, could claim for himself the distinguished honour of having consecrated more Churches than any Christian Bishop since the days of the Apostles. By the Charge before us, however, we find that this pre-eminence belongs at present to the Bishop of Chester. Within the period of his Episcopate, no less than one hundred and seventy additional Churches have opened their doors within his single diocese to receive a people, of whom the greater

part were before practically excluded from the benefits of "the Establishment." And it is not less satisfactory to know that God has so prepared the soil, that the harvest seems to follow close upon the sowing of the seed. Numerous are the places where, a few years ago, hundreds, if not thousands of families were congregated without any regular provision for their spiritual culture. The visitor of these districts, now, will not only find the house set apart for the worship of God, but the minister, whose charge it is, permanently settled in his parsonage; the children collected in schools; the people systematically instructed; the general aspect of a Christian community, where recently all was barren. "In other places," continues the Bishop, "if there is not yet a Church, there is the threshold of a Church—for so, in a double sense, I may term those licensed buildings, which are preparing the way for Churches, and serving as substitutes for them; and in which thousands of the poorer classes are receiving instruction, which they could not obtain elsewhere, at the hands of Curates supported partly by private liberality, but chiefly by the two* invaluable Societies which have relieved our most urgent wants, by supplying the salary of Curates. Through these united aids, the Church has gained a vast accession of strength in those districts, where her weakness had been previously most apparent, and where the existing clergy were hopelessly struggling against a mountain of impossibilities, in the vain attempt to fulfil the task assigned them."—(pp. 11, 12.)

Such then is the state of things in the Diocese of Chester—which exhibits generally a growing attachment to the Church; and of which it can be said, that "the number of attendants at public worship, the number of communicants, the number of candidates for confirmation have increased far beyond the growth of the population." How far this auspicious result may be ascribed to the legitimate influence of a Christian Bishop—one who among Elders is also a fellow Elder, counselling, encouraging, sympathizing and co-operating with his Clergy—at once exhorting, comforting, charging them to walk worthy of God, and instructing them by his own example how to do so, we can well imagine, though the Bishop does not intimate;—nor can we fail to observe whence that influence is derived. The Bishop of Chester has not only drunk deeply of the water of life, but has imbibed it at the fountain-head. Expert in the writings and traditions of the Fathers, he has yet turned aside from the broken cisterns of tradition and antiquity to the spring of living waters, unsealed to us in the Gospel; and he regards the Church as she has been developed to us in the oracles of God, not as she has been disguised and deformed by the

* The Church Pastoral Aid Society, and Additional Curates' Fund.

presumption or the sophistry of man. Fully alive to the grounds of excellence and superiority which belong to the Church established in our land; to its manifold claims upon our reverence, as based upon antiquity, accredited by authority, and sanctioned by the judgment of the wisest and greatest names; appreciating most highly her plain and Scriptural Articles; her spiritual and comprehensive Liturgy; her agreement with the earliest examples of Christian discipleship, and the extrinsic advantages which she possesses—justly possesses—as the Church of the nation, the Church of our forefathers;—the Bishop has yet no sympathy with those pseudo-churchmen who think that the readiest mode of exalting their own Church is to dismantle, and disorganize, and unchristianize every other. He even places Diocesan Episcopacy together with infant baptism, Liturgical forms, and a national establishment, as only among points which lie, so to speak, *in medio*; on the debateable ground which may be occupied by true Christians;—declaring that “the unity which the Scriptures demand, is the unity of those who hold alike the great doctrines of Christian truth, but consent to differ on matters concerning which Scripture does not carry determinate conviction to every honest mind.” Heartily according in these liberal and truly enlightened sentiments, we hasten to extract from this golden charge a passage, which explains more clearly than any which we can find elsewhere, the Scriptural notion of a Church. The Bishop has already been combating, with his usual ability, the first great error of the Oxford Tractarians—reserve in preaching the doctrine of the Atonement—and in enforcing the central truth of a simple reliance on Christ Jesus;—he now proceeds to deal with that sophism, which, under colour of magnifying the Saviour, through the medium of the Church, really magnifies the Church, to the depreciation and disparagement of the Saviour.

“The other error to which I purpose to allude is no less injurious to the Saviour’s glory. Practically he is treated with dishonour, when the Church which he has established is made to usurp his place, to perform his acts, to receive his homage: is so represented as to be, virtually, the author of salvation, instead of the channel through which salvation flows. This is, in truth, to depose him from his throne, and to invest his subjects with the authority which belongs to himself alone.

“It is convenient, no doubt, in language, to embody the multitude who believe in Christ under one comprehensive term: and our Lord has himself taught us by example that we may do this safely and legitimately. But language may mislead. We may personify a body, for the convenience of discourse, and by degrees forget that a community is not a person. And it is still worse, if the body which was first personified comes afterwards to be deified. Yet a process of this kind has gone on with regard to the Christian Church. When Jesus declared that he would build his Church upon a rock, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, he simply declared that there should hereafter ever be a body of men believing in Him as the Son of God—a body which Satan might assail, but should never succeed in destroying. He did not say that he would set up a power upon earth, which

should possess his authority, act in his stead, and as his vicegerent dispense his anger or his favour. We look in vain for a single sentence in which such a purpose is implied: a purpose so important, and, I may add, so extraordinary, that it must have been written in words which none could fail to read. But advantage has been taken of the obscurity of language, to maintain and encourage this idea. The Church has been made, first an abstraction, and then a person, and then a Saviour. The Church, thus invested with divinity, has the minister as her visible representative: and he, explaining the prophetic anticipation, has assumed the place of God. We too well know what corruptions found entrance at this source; what opportunity was given to the exercise of the worst of human passions; what food was applied to malice, enmity, pride, covetousness, and ambition. So that one of the first and most needful works of the Reformers was to pierce the veil, to divest the Church of the mystery in which it had been shrouded, and to disclose it to the world in its true and scriptural form, as the company of believers. The Church is that body which had assembled in the upper chamber at Jerusalem, and there received the promise of their risen and ascended Lord. The Church is that party which united together, and 'had all things common,' and 'continued in the apostle's fellowship.' The Church is that 'congregation of faithful men,' in all ages and of all countries, who maintain in their purity the doctrines and institutions of the Gospel. The ministers of this Church are those called to serve the united body: to perform the prescribed rites: to teach, to rebuke, to exhort, to warn, to comfort; and to commit perpetually to other faithful men the things which they have themselves received.

"Such is the simple analysis of the Church: the Holy Catholic Church, of which Christ is the head, and with which he has engaged to be present by his Spirit unto the end of the world. We must beware of assigning to the members, or to the body which the members compose, a power which really belongs to the Head alone. If we speak of the ark of Christ's Church, we must remember that we are only speaking metaphorically. That ark is not limited to any special locality on earth, like the ark of Noah: it extends as far as the knowledge of Christ extends: for He is the true ark, prepared of God for the saving of all who commit themselves to Him. The ministrations of the Church are the door by which the community of the faithful on earth is entered: but Christ is the only door by which heaven can be entered; and many may be admitted into the visible fold, who remain for ever unknown to the true Shepherd. The members of the Church are branches of the vine; but the Church is not the vine: that name belongs to Christ alone. The Church is 'the pillar and ground of the truth:' but the Church is not 'the truth;' neither has it life in itself; Christ alone is 'the way, the truth, and the life,' through which every individual member of the Church must seek access to God.

"Yet all this, undeniable in itself, is practically contradicted, whenever the services and the ordinances and the ministerial office are magnified beyond their due proportions, or placed before the people with a prominence to which they have no claim. Church principles, in their proper sense, all must approve. All must approve of that cordial agreement with the articles, that sincere preference of the services, that willing conformity to the discipline of the Church, which show that our profession is honest and consistent. This, and nothing else, must be the meaning of the phrase, unless it is intended to avow that the Church is to assume the place of the Church's head, and to be revered, served, and trusted instead of Him. No one will deny our right to maintain Church principles, in preference to the principles of the Presbyterian or Independent. But, on the other hand, I must think that to set up, as it were, Church principles in opposition to the principles of the Gospel, and place them in invidious contrast, is alike unreasonable and unscriptural. It is to confound the means of grace with the Author of grace: to worship the thing made, and to dishonour the Maker. It is to array against Christ the instrumentality which he has established against Satan.

He appointed his ministers, that there might be a perpetual provision for opposing 'the power of darkness,' a perpetual provision for carrying into effect, through conviction and conversion and sanctification, his merciful purpose of 'bringing many sons to glory.' He instituted his sacraments, that they who observed them might be a visible body of witnesses to him in the world: and that, after the usual manner of the divine operations, there might be known and manifest channels in which his Spirit might flow, to the edification and comfort of believers.

"Therefore he ordained the ministry, and he ordained the sacraments, that there might be a Church—a continual 'congregation of faithful men.' And shall this Church boast itself against its Author, and claim a power which he has never given? Shall the earthly members assume the authority of their heavenly Principal? Such seems to be the case, when they confound church membership with faith: or so magnify the ministrations belonging to their office, as virtually to represent that, except through their instrumentality, there is no salvation."—(pp. 30—36.)

It is quite unnecessary to weaken the force of these observations by one syllable of comment. The barrier which they raise against error, constructed as it is of that material which will bid defiance to the shock that shall dismantle the earth and dissolve the elements, is altogether impregnable. We have no doubt that the Tractarian writers, who cannot overthrow, will endeavour to evade it; and, with their usual discretion, treat the Charge as if it had never been written. Happily, however, it does not stand alone. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, who cannot even be suspected of that bias towards the opinions popularly called Evangelical, with which the Bishop of Chester has been directly charged, has felt himself constrained, by the urgency of the crisis, and the diffusion in his own Diocese of opinions subversive of the first and fundamental principles of a Reformed Protestant Church, to lift his voice against those errors which touch vitally the Christian character of our own Establishment. "By nature," his Lordship says, "I am not an alarmist;" and we may add, so far as the tendency of the mind can be developed by the outward conduct, by disposition he is not a controversialist; yet he is drawn, by what appears to him a paramount and irresistible necessity, to avow his sentiments respecting those parts of the newly-propounded theories of which he has been competently informed. It may not be unknown to most of our readers, that the Bishop has laboured for several years under an affection of the sight, which he has described, in phraseology somewhat reminding us of the Author of the Rambler, "as a calamitous obscuration of the visual organ." This, however, if an impediment to reading, is proportionably favourable to reflection, and we may therefore believe, as indeed we should expect, that the terms employed express the deliberate judgment of the Bishop's mind. Now Dr. Pusey, in his letter to Dr. Jelf, has spoken of the perplexity which might occur if any of

our Bishops should advert to Tract 90, and, without explaining their own views, seem to countenance its condemnation. "There are many," he says, "by whom the slightest word of their Bishop would be deeply felt, and who would be at a loss to decide whether they could continue to serve in a Diocese in which their views of the Articles, in subscribing which they have been admitted to their cure, seemed to have been censured." We know that by some disciples of this school, the authority of the Bishop of Chester has not been regarded, (for what reasons they can best explain to themselves) as conveying the full power of the Episcopal condemnation. We think, however, that the sentence of the Bishop of Gloucester, expressed as it is with his Lordship's characteristic urbanity and unwillingness to give pain, and extorted from him by a stern sense of duty, will not prove a "*telum imbellè sine ictu*," even to those who are arrayed in the panoply of presumed and self-complacent Catholicity.

"Having on many occasions experienced the confiding disposition of my clergy, and their wish to learn the views of their Bishop upon all questions regarding our beloved Church, I am sensible that they would be dissatisfied, if left in ignorance of his opinions upon matters touching so vitally her Christian character. Upon such parts, therefore, of the newly-propounded theories as I have had competent means of informing myself, I shall not hesitate to avow my sentiments, particularly on the three following points:— (1.) A recommendation to use reserve in preaching the doctrine of our Lord's Atonement: (2.) the claims asserted in favour of Tradition, as part of the Christian Revelation: and (3.) the recently-published commentary upon our Articles of Religion.

"First, then, I cannot help regretting that any members of our Church should have recommended reserve in declaring to the people any part of the doctrines of Scripture. I regard it as contrary to the apostolic practice, to refuse to 'declare all the counsel of God,'—and as tending to rob us of one of the greatest blessings which flow from a pure religion, whereby the Book of Life is freely and unreservedly laid open to mankind. The duty of 'searching the Scriptures' is not confined to the minister; it attaches itself to every Christian who can read them. There is no more dangerous doctrine than that of leaving to the judgment of fallible man what parts of God's word are to be published, and what are to be kept back; and I am disposed to believe that the authors of such a proposition did not themselves sufficiently consider the consequences which might follow its adoption. But of all subjects, that which it would, I think, be most inexcusable to keep back from the people, is the atonement made by our blessed Saviour for the sins of mankind; since upon that truth must ever rest the key-stone of the Christian edifice. That Christ died to save sinners, that our nature had become corrupt and depraved through sin, and that by the sacrifice of our blessed Lord upon the cross once offered, atonement and satisfaction were made, and the wrath of God averted, are among the first truths which we communicate to the youthful Christian; they are likewise inculcated in the reception of the blessed Eucharist, as well as in various parts of the formularies of our Church. Upon what principle, then, can they be held back in our Christian teaching? It is true that this doctrine may be distorted and misrepresented, and that sinners may be led to flatter themselves with hopes of being saved while they continue in their sin. But 'we have not so learned Christ;' nor are we afraid to declare to the people 'the riches of his grace,'

because some presumptuous men have rushed into the errors which the Apostles themselves noted among contemporary heresies. Were we ashamed to declare 'all the counsel of God,' as we have received it from the Scriptures, we should at once forfeit the title of an Apostolical Church. Let us not, therefore, cease to proclaim 'Christ crucified,' as the most important commission of our ministry, and as the sole ground upon which we teach our hearers to rest their hopes of forgiveness and reconciliation to God.

"These writers speak of Scripture and Tradition as the two channels in which the Christian Revelation has been communicated. That they mean thereby to elevate tradition into the same rank with the written Word of God, I will not believe; but the vulgar and unlearned may and will be induced to suppose that such is their intention; and hence a fatal delusion may ensue, tending to recall the various errors and abuses of Romanism. Respecting the sufficiency of Scripture, our sixth Article of Religion is so distinct and explicit, declaring that it contains all things necessary for salvation, and requiring nothing to be believed as an Article of the Faith but what is contained therein, or can be proved thereby, that upon this head there hardly seems to be any room for controversy among ourselves. And in regard to points of discipline, our Church has endeavoured to preserve a similar rule, adopting the practices of the earliest period which the records of Christian antiquity have preserved; but still, even in these cases, appealing for their confirmation or justification to the Scriptures. Thus are the institution of infant baptism, and the observance of the Lord's day, enjoined, not merely on the authority of tradition, however ancient and undoubted, but because, though not commanded in Scripture, they have the warranty of scriptural authority, inasmuch as they may fairly be inferred from what is actually written. To recount the evils which would flow from a large admission of traditional authority, the present occasion would not permit. But this main distinction is never to be lost sight of—What is found in the inspired Scriptures has come to us with the warranty of Heaven: what is handed down through other sources of primitive belief rests, after all, upon the authority of man, exposed to the errors, distortions, and corruptions arising from the ignorance, superstition, or presumption of our nature, from which the early ages of Christianity were not exempt. Those, therefore, who would receive tradition as a part of revelation, must appeal to something more than earthly sagacity and judgment to separate truth from error: and they will find themselves driven to the necessity of investing some human authority with the divine attribute of infallibility—that very assumption of the Romish Church, from which so many of its corruptions have been derived.

"The perusal of the 'Remarks upon the Thirty-nine Articles' has filled me with astonishment and concern. The ostensible object of this tract is to show, that a person adopting the doctrines of the Council of Trent, with the single exception of the Pope's supremacy, might sincerely and conscientiously sign the Articles of the Church of England. But the real object at which the writer seems to be labouring, is to prove that the differences in doctrine which separate the Churches of England and Rome will, upon examination, vanish. Upon this point much ingenuity, and, I am forced to add, much sophistry is exerted, and I think exerted in vain: It is well known that the Articles were framed in a great degree with the view of purifying the Church from Romish abuses, and that the framers themselves were those ever-honoured martyrs, who having accomplished the good work of Reformation with unexampled forbearance and discretion, sealed the testimony of their sincerity by cheerfully submitting to the flames of Romish persecution.

"In the writings which I have seen of these ecclesiastics, there appears to be a constant and industrious endeavour to compliment the Papal Church, to extenuate its faults, and to apologise for its enormities. It is true that the distinguished authors themselves have unequivocally denied any attachment on their own part to Rome, and have decisively repudiated that imputation. But if through their agency a school be formed, of which one characteristic

shall be a leaning towards Romanism, the disciples cannot be prevented going farther than their masters contemplate. And when we consider the peculiar art with which the Papal system is organized, and the readiness with which it enlists into its service the frailties, the passions, and the imaginations of men, it is impossible not to entertain serious apprehensions at the course which has been adopted by persons, whose learning, talents, and character ensure to them influence among their contemporaries.

I have now, my reverend brethren, performed my duty in avowing my sentiments respecting these writings; and never did I perform any public duty which gave me greater pain. It is true that I am not personally acquainted with the distinguished individuals who are reputed to be the principal authors of the Tracts. But I lament that persons gifted with every qualification which can enable men to improve and enlighten their fellow-creatures, should now occupy a questionable position, and excite alarm among the friends of that Church of which they are eminently qualified to be the support and the ornament. I am, however, well acquainted with some persons, members of my own diocese, whom report numbers among the supporters of the system which those writers recommend and uphold. And I bear my willing testimony to the exemplary purity of their lives, their doctrine, and their opinions. Persons more diligent in every pastoral duty, more charitable towards all who differ from them in sentiment, or more fraught with all the virtues which are the genuine fruit of Christ's religion, I never knew. It is impossible to suspect such men of an inclination to leave worshipping the Lord in the beauty of holiness, and to encourage or tolerate a system, in which human inventions and abuses stand side by side with evangelical truth. But if an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel than that which we have received from the Apostles and Evangelists, I trust that he will preach in vain. We must remember that the subject is one which admits not of compromise; that we are bound by the most solemn and most responsible of duties to preserve to the Church that scriptural purity in which it has been handed down to us by our reformers. Let us then be instant in prayer to the Almighty for the unity, the peace, and the guidance of his Church: but, above all things, 'let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering:' 'let us exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine,' and endeavour to reclaim those who would 'turn away their ears from the truth, and be turned unto fables,' in order that when 'we have fought our fight,' and have 'finished our course,' we may be able to add with the Apostle, that we have 'kept the faith.'"—(pp. 32—38.)

We are fully persuaded, that in this decided, though most lenient and reluctant condemnation, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol cannot be taxed with any undue measure of severity. So far otherwise, indeed, that in his anxiety to commend what in such individuals is really praiseworthy, the Bishop declares the "impossibility of a suspicion," where circumstances have recently shewn that he might justly have apprehended the certainty of a fact. One of these persons, "exemplary in the purity of his life," if not of his "doctrine and opinions," has left "worshipping the Lord in the beauty of holiness;" and has not only "encouraged and tolerated," (that alas! he had done through a course of years) but has even adopted "a system, in which human inventions and abuses stand side by side with Evangelical truth." This occurrence, so calamitous to the Church, has indeed befallen in another diocese—but

"Tua res agitur, paries cum proximus ardet ;

and, if report speaks true, the announced publication of a third Episcopal charge, similarly denouncing the quasi-Romanism of what it has become of late years the fashion to call high-churchmanship, is likely to cause the secession of one among the Oxford Triumvirate, who would "feel deeply the slightest word of his Bishop," and who, now that the trumpet of his spiritual Overseer has blown no uncertain sound, is said to be girding on his armour, and preparing himself for the battle. Nay, we have even heard, through one of the hundred mouths of Rumour, a vaunt of the Bishop of Melipotamus (Dr. Wiseman) that he had the whole of the Tractarian party within his toils, excepting that *reluctans draco*, the astute and wary Vicar of Leeds. However this may be, the Bishop of Gloucester has discharged his duty, and relieved his conscience; he has publicly, and most truly declared, that "the subject is one which admits not of compromise; but we are bound by the most solemn and the most responsible of duties, to preserve to the Church that Scriptural purity in which it has been handed down to us by our Reformers." We rejoice that the Bishop has here assumed the high and only safe ground of Scriptural purity as the citadel of the Anglican Church, and that he has recognized, under their proper as well as popular designation, those whom she delights to honour as her second Fathers and Founders; those whose principle through life, and whose profession, even amidst the flames, was precisely the same with the emphatic declaration of the Bishop;—"What is found in the inspired Scriptures has come down to us with the warranty of Heaven; what is handed down through other sources of primitive belief rests, after all, upon the authority of man." p. 35. So long as this broad principle is thus plainly avowed, and thus forcibly asserted by the Bishops and chief Pastors of our Church, we entertain little apprehension about the secession of individuals, however distinguished for profound learning, pure morals, or ascetic piety. The excision of inferior members, however it may pain the body, does not affect the vitality of the nobler parts. They sympathize and suffer with the meanest, but they are only the more bold and watchful in protecting and preserving that which still is sound. However they may deplore the apostacy of one, or deprecate the aberrations of another, they will maintain the integrity of the body, by "holding the head—from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." "The shew of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body" will indeed, as it has done in every age, impose upon those who trust in their own hearts, and lean to their own understandings; but the line between the revelation of God and the

tradition and invention of man, if made, as it ought to be, clear, broad, open, palpable, will suffice to protect him who is mean in his own eyes, and lowly in his own sight, from making shipwreck of faith and of a good conscience upon the same rock of error. Let the preaching of the clergy in Bishop Monk's diocese embody, without compromise, the principles of their Bishop's charge, and this good effect will ensue—that "those members of his diocese, whom report numbers among the supporters of the system which the (Oxford) writers recommend and uphold," will either, by preaching Christ, demonstrate its fallacy; or, by seceding to a Church which places tradition above Scripture, affirm its truth. Restoration or exclusion would be the alternative—and painful as it is to contemplate the latter, we cannot but remember and apply the words of Him who said, "It is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, than that thy whole body should be cast into hell."

We will not, at present, continue our comment upon these excellent charges, both of which are not only imbued with the true apostolical spirit of episcopacy, but which are alike documents of the highest value under the present circumstances of the Church. The words of neither Prelate are "slight words," though we are reminded by the one of the bias which swayed the mind of Peter toward those who were of the circumcision, and by the other of the energetic protest and uncompromising sincerity of Paul. We do not, however, regard the former as the less valuable testimony of the two. Like Peter in his predilection, but unlike Peter in his dissimulation, the Bishop of Gloucester, with whatever compunctious yearnings towards those whom he censures and condemns, has yet "walked uprightly according to the truth of the gospel"—and the very reluctance with which he bears his testimony is at once honourable to himself and profitable to the Church. His was the charity that hoped all things—and which then only ceased to hope, when it would have become, in continuing to do so, the credulity which is a traitor to its own convictions. We hope in our next number, that the enlargement of our limits will enable us to enter more fully into the subject, and that we shall be enabled to twine a threefold cord that will not quickly be broken, by placing the deliberate judgment of THREE Anglican Bishops in contradistinction to the anti-Protestant and anti-scriptural dogmas of three Anglican Presbyters, at least unless one of them (or more) shall have ceased to bear that name before its publication. Meantime, in days like these, when they who were once as pillars of the Church give way, and they who once, as good shepherds, guided the flock of Christ into the green pastures of gospel truth, and fed them beside the still waters of

the river that maketh glad the city of God, are seen themselves to deviate into the waste howling wilderness of human fictions, fallacies, inventions, and impositions, it becomes more than ever needful to make the path of life so plain, that the wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein. We require to be pointed to some mode of discerning between the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error: some rule that shall be plain, brief, obvious, practical: accessible to the peasant, and intelligible even to the child. Such a test, such a standard, Bishop Monk has suggested in the passage already quoted from page 35 of his Charge, which is indeed nothing more than the acknowledgment of the Apostle Peter. "Thou hast the words of eternal life;" and the comment of the Anglican Church, conformed to that acknowledgment, and based upon it; "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be received as an article of the faith, or thought requisite and necessary to salvation." Here then is the true centre of unity; here is the unerring rule, the unfailing test of faith; here is the balance of the sanctuary, which an infant hand may poise. "Thou hast the words of eternal life;" none hath the words of eternal life but THOU. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God;" nothing is given by inspiration of God BUT scripture. "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day;" but he shall not be judged by any word save that which I have spoken. Whatever Fathers have transmitted, whatever theologians have disputed, whatever ministers have preached, whatever councils have decreed, whatever Churches have imposed, ALL that is not substantially contained within the oracles of God shall be as nothing; the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is, and nothing shall abide the ordeal but the pure and perfect words of God—"tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Accordingly, the plain, sincere, unlettered Christian, with the Bible in his hand and the spirit of God in his heart, possesses as sure a guide to life and immortality, as the profound and indefatigable scholar, who has exhausted the intellectual treasures of a hundred generations, devoting the nights of a long life to sleepless meditation, and its days to elaborate research. "No man can come to me," said Christ, "unless the Father which hath sent me draw him;" and who can imagine for an instant, that the Father does not draw the simple by his sincerity, as well as the sage by his philosophy; nay rather who can doubt, that he who does the will of God with singleness of heart, acquires most of the doctrine

which is apprehended by faith alone; and that not a few are to be found among the most obscure and despised members of our Church, the peasants of the village or the paupers of the town, who could apply to themselves, did they but know the proportion of faith, the memorable words of the Psalmist, "I have more understanding than my teachers, for thy testimonies are my meditation: I understand more than the ancients, because I keep thy precepts." Here then, in the testimonies, the precepts, the oracles of God; here in His word, which is all truth, and only truth, here is the spring of living waters,—here is the well of salvation out of which water may be drawn with joy—here is the river of the water of life, out of which whosoever thirsteth may drink freely. Cisterns hewn out by mortal hand, whether by Apostles or Evangelists, Fathers or Bishops, Martyrs or Reformers, are only to be sought and to be valued, in so far as they are replenished from *this*: and no sooner does the tradition or teaching of man diverge, even by a hair-breadth, from the commandment of God, than it becomes the "broken cistern, which will hold no water." Some, whom the Bishop of Gloucester has candidly described as maintaining "a high tone of devotional piety," and distinguished by "careful and diligent attention to the holy ordinances and godly discipline of our Church," have been drawn, as we have reason to know, within the vortex of Romish error, by the delusive hope of finding a measure of unity within the pale of the misnamed Catholic Church, which is not to be found without it: but there may be a *semblance*, as well as a *substance* of unity, and surely it is better far to be divided about the application of Scripture to non-essentials, whether of doctrine or discipline, than agreed in that unity of worship which teaches for doctrines the commandments of man. We are admonished in Scripture not to follow a multitude to do evil—and does not the same caution apply equally to the belief of an error, or to the disparagement of the truth? Let it ever be impressed upon the people by their Pastors, as upon the Pastors themselves by their appointed and accredited Superiors in these admirable Charges, that the word of God only is the truth by which souls can be sanctified and saved—let them be stirred up to adopt for their own the acknowledgment of Peter to His Divine Master—"Thou hast the words of eternal life. Thou alone hast them, and Thou hast them all. From Thee they all originate; of Thee they all testify; towards Thee they all converge, in Thee they all concentrate. To Thee give all the prophets witness, that through thy name whosoever believeth in Thee shall receive remission of sins. Thou art the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believ-

eth. Thou art the One Mediator between God and Man : Thou art the only propitiation for sins ; Thou art the only prevailing Advocate with the Father. Without Thee there can be no intercession, no pardon, no acceptance, no salvation,—without Thee saints are nothing, angels are nothing, the Virgin Mary herself is nothing ; images, relics, crosses, pilgrimages, penances, are less than nothing, and vanity. Thou art everything. Thou art All in All. Thou hast the words of eternal life. Thy word is truth—the truth that enlightens, the truth that instructs, the truth that quickens, the truth that sanctifies ; and nowhere is truth to be found among the generations of mankind that will sustain the mortal in suffering, and cheer the immortal in dying, but in thy word. To whom then shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and there can be no true Church upon earth but that which is based upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, and of which Thou art the corner-stone.”

A LETTER TO A FRIEND, *on the Evidences and Theory of Christianity.* By Lord LINDSAY. London : Hatchard. 1841.

ONE of the most gratifying and hope-inspiring signs of the present day, is, the general spread of a higher tone of *Christian* feeling ; reaching upwards, through the middle classes even to the highest, and bringing many a coronet to the foot of the cross. Many, very many names connected with old ancestral fame, and decked with the honours of the peerage, are already enlisted under the banners of the Crucified ; and every week seems to add to their number. And how gratifying was the slight but speaking circumstance recently named in the public prints, when the youthful heir of perhaps the greatest possessions in the Welsh Principality, calmly warned a crowd of gay and volatile visitants, that it was to be a rule in his mansion that no carriage left its gates on the sabbath-day, except to convey those to the church who could not otherwise reach it. That brow wears no coronet, for it has been repeatedly declined ; but the manhood of that youth was celebrated by the founding of a spacious church. Shall we not entertain high hopes for the house of Wynnstay ? Can the promise ever fail, “ Those that honour ME I will honour ? ”

In the unpretending little duodecimo now before us, we have

another instance of a similar kind. The heir to the earldom of Balcarras turned his steps, in the tour which it is customary for the youthful aristocracy to take at a certain period of life, to the Holy Land. Nor was he a hasty or careless visitant; but gave to the world the most substantial proofs of the depth of the interest he felt in traversing the land over whose fields the feet of the Only-begotten Son of the Father had often passed. His narrative appeared some months before the commencement of this journal, or we should have gladly noticed it. Yet perhaps the present simpler and humbler work confers more real honour on the noble author. It offers the best possible proof of the depth and earnestness of Lord Lindsay's religious feelings. There is not the slightest trace of any desire for fame or applause;—real utility, the welfare of the souls of others, is the evident object at which the writer aims.

The letter purports to be, and we doubt not is, a *real* one; i. e. a friendly epistle actually sent to one of whom the writer evidently feared that he required even a first introduction to Christianity. Lord Lindsay, therefore, "begins at the beginning;" and endeavours to lead the enquirer on, step by step, from certain known and admitted facts, until he shews him the absolute necessity, on any rational principles, of yielding to the claims of the word of God.

We hesitate whether to offer a synopsis of his argument. Probably it would suffer in our hands. We will therefore only say, that if any of our readers have among their friends any of that numerous class who neither admit nor deny Christianity, and who yet are sometimes willing to think and to read on the subject, they can hardly do better than to put into their hands Lord Lindsay's very neat, succinct, and winning statement of the argument.

But we now come to the second part of a critic's duty,—the more disagreeable one—that of taking exceptions against those passages which appear to us to be faulty. In Lord Lindsay's work we have observed only three of this description; and neither of them detracts much from the intrinsic value of the work. Still, we must point them out, both to guard the reader against imagining them included in our otherwise unqualified approval; and also to suggest to his Lordship the propriety of reconsidering them, when preparing future editions.

The first occurs at p. 29, and is as follows:—

"It was not unjust that the holy and good Creator should demand perfect obedience from a creature whom he had formed competent to render that obedience. Adam, however, did eat of the tree, at the instigation of Eve, his wife, who had been beguiled by Satan, under the form of a serpent, as here by implication, and elsewhere expressly, affirmed. Having eaten, they became conscious of good and evil, but in a very different manner from what

they expected; the propensity to moral evil, latent in their constitution, became developed, and the taint of corruption has descended from them to their whole posterity."

We cannot but think that this is an oversight; a hasty expression, not sufficiently considered. Where can Lord Lindsay have learnt that our first parents, as they came from the hands of their Creator, had "*a propensity to moral evil, latent in their constitution?*"

Adam and Eve were both made "in the image and likeness of God" (Gen. i. 26, 27); and they were included in the judgment of their Creator, among the things which were "*very good*" (v. 31.) How could this have been, if, in the eyes of the Searcher of all hearts, they had been seen to have "*a propensity to moral evil, latent in their constitution?*" We cannot doubt that his Lordship will remove this blemish from a future edition.

The next questionable assertion occurs at p. 70, where his Lordship says,—

"Yet, on the other hand, while fully admitting that the salvation of every human being is from first to last the work of God, we must beware of imputing favouritism to the Deity, in the supposition that the remedy is only partially applied, or that stronger influence is exerted on one man than another, in order to win him to heaven."

Now in questioning the propriety of thus speaking, we shall not intrude into the unseen things of the Holy Spirit; nor shall we even call in to our aid such Scriptures as those of Rom. ix. 18—21—"Therefore hath he mercy on whom He will have mercy; and whom he will, He hardeneth."—"Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour?" We ever prefer, when it is possible, an appeal to plain and obvious and indisputable facts.

Just a century ago, there had grown up, in a forest near Bristol, a large population of savages,—the colliers of Kingswood. They were wholly without instruction of any kind, having neither school or place of worship, and were, to use Southey's language, "in a state of bestial ignorance; heathens, or worse than heathens, in the midst of a Christian country, and brutal as savages, in the close vicinity of the second city in England."*

Whitfield was planning a visit to the Indians of North America, when some one said to him, "Why go abroad for this?—have we not Indians enough at home? If you have a mind to convert Indians, there are colliers enough in Kingswood."

On this hint he went to Kingswood. Place of meeting there was none; so, following the example of his Great Master, "who

* Southey's Life of Wesley, vol. i. p. 230.

“ had a mountain for his pulpit, and the heavens for a sounding-board,”—he addressed about two hundred of these poor creatures. “ His second audience consisted of two thousand; his third, from four to five thousand; and they went on increasing to ten, fourteen, and twenty thousand.” “ The deep silence of his rude auditors was the first proof that he had impressed them; and soon, as he says, he saw the white gutters made by the tears which plentifully fell down their black cheeks,—black as they came out of their coal-pits.”

Not to dwell too long upon particulars,—these poor men felt the power of Divine truth, raised schools and chapels for themselves, and hundreds, or more probably *thousands* now in glory, will have to thank God to all eternity for Whitfield’s visit to Kingswood. This took place in 1739. Up to that period these poor creatures had been left “ in bestial ignorance,” no man caring for their souls. Those who lived until February 1739 heard the joyful sound; those who died in 1738, 1737, 1736, and years previously, died without hearing it.

As a matter of fact, then, can we assent to Lord Lindsay’s proposition, that “ no stronger influence is exerted on one man than on another, in order to win him to heaven ? ”

We turn to a second case. One of the most holy, devoted, self-denying missionaries that ever lived,—David Brainerd,—was moved to give himself up to the work of a missionary among the poor North American Indians living near the Forks of the Delaware. An extraordinary power and blessing accompanied his labours. In a little Indian village, there were found as many as an hundred persons at one time, eagerly enquiring, “ What must we do to be saved ? ” A considerable number were baptized by Brainerd himself, on the most satisfactory evidence of a spiritual change; and the remains of this work were visible many years after the missionary’s own death.

Yet were there very many other Indian villages in North America, to whom no Brainerd was sent, and who remained in all the filth and abominations of their devil-worship. *As a matter of fact*, then, can it be true, that “ no stronger influence is exerted on one man than on another, in order to win him to heaven ? ”

But let us observe, for a moment, the bearing of this question. If Lord Lindsay’s view be correct, that “ we must beware of imputing favouritism to the Deity, in the supposition that the remedy is only partially applied, or that stronger influence is exerted on one man than another, in order to win him to heaven ; ”—then the inference is obvious and unavoidable. The difference between one man and another, *not being in God*,

must be *in himself*. The same influence being alike exerted on all ;—it rests with each to determine whether that influence shall be effectual for his salvation, or not. According to this hypothesis the apostle must have been in error, when he exclaimed, “Who maketh thee to differ from another? And what hast thou, that thou didst not receive?” For, if “no stronger influence is exerted on one man than on another, in order to win him to heaven ;” it is quite clear that no one but the man himself “maketh him to differ from another ;” and that the ultimate cause why any one is saved must be, *his own choice, his own volition, his own exertions*.

Lord Lindsay adduces the general invitations of the gospel, “Go ye unto all the world, and preach the gospel to *every creature*.” But really, with submission to his Lordship, these passages have no bearing whatever on the totally distinct question, Whether there be any such thing as distinguishing grace? The whole Bible, from the first page to the last, seems to say that there is ;—seems to tell us of frequent acts of choice on the part of God ; and acts of choice not arising out of conduct. “The children being not yet born, *neither having done any good or evil*, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, *not of works*, but of him that calleth.” (Rom. ix. 11.) However, we must not pursue this deep and inscrutable subject ;—only we would beg of Lord Lindsay not to be quite so rapid or positive in his conclusion, that “no stronger influence is exerted on one man than another, in order to win him to heaven.”

The third point to which we must allude, is one on which we feel it the more needful to be distinct, inasmuch as the notion espoused by Lord Lindsay is one which we perceive to have been rapidly gaining ground, of late, among many of the most valuable members of our Church. Both in print and in private conversation it meets us more and more frequently and positively, every day we pass. In Lord Lindsay's pages it is thus stated :—

“Baptism, the rite antitypical to the Hebraic circumcision, and figurative, by the immersion and emersion of the new-born infant from the ‘laver of regeneration,’ of that ‘death unto sin and new birth’ (or resurrection) ‘unto righteousness,’ which the Holy Spirit works in the Christian ; the rite by which, externally and visibly, he is introduced within the pale of the Church, and made a covenanted partaker of its spiritual privileges, and by which, internally and invisibly, a seed (as it were) of Divine grace is conveyed to him, which, though it may lie dormant for years, retains its vitality, and will germinate in the quickening beams of the Sun of Righteousness, whenever the strong axe of conviction breaks through the ice of unbelief with which the atmosphere of the world is apt to incrust the heart in which it lies.”—(pp. 74, 75.)

This is. the *via media* between the baptismal justification of

Messrs. Newman and Pusey, and the "no wholesome effect or operation without faith" of the xxvth article. It is the modern way of escape, devised for those who feel pressed between the difficulties, on either hand, of the great importance evidently attached to baptism in the formularies of the Church,—and the equally evident absence of all perceptible effect, in the cases of the vast majority of children baptized. On the one hand it is constantly seen, that the baptized and unbaptized children of the same family (instances of which frequently occur among the poor) exhibit no perceptible difference even to the closest scrutiny;—on the other, the declarations of a mighty change having passed on all who have "*rightly* received" the sacrament, are frequent and unequivocal. And instead of escaping from this difficulty by the only legitimate path, of the unquestionable fact, that the vast majority of children *do not* "RIGHTLY receive" the sacrament; another and more palatable, because more recondite, hypothesis is invented,—namely, that a change *does* pass upon all children baptized; but only an imperceptible one. A new life is given, but no breath or motion may betoken, for many years, its presence. "A seed of Divine grace is conveyed," says Lord Lindsay, "which may lie dormant for years." And this he predicates of *all* infants "introduced, externally and visibly, within the pale of the Church."

Such is the speculation, or supposition, recently brought into fashion, and which is now becoming very popular with numbers of good men who shrink with alarm from the higher demands of Dr. Pusey's system. At first sight it appears as harmless in its operation as it is benevolent in its intent; but we doubt its innoxious character, or we should not here give ourselves the trouble to investigate its truth and lawfulness.

Probably no mere *speculation* in theology *can* be innoxious. By a "speculation" we mean what in plainer English is called a "guess," or "supposition;" a mode of settling a dispute or escaping a difficulty which is not furnished us in God's word; but springs out of some fertile invention of the human mind. Of this class the most harmless—if any *can* be harmless—perhaps are those which endeavour to surmise the various arrangements of the invisible world; the number and order of the angelic existences; the state of the disembodied spirits of men; the mutual recognition of human beings in another world, and divers other and similar questions. It may be that little harm will arise from *such* discussions; but less safe is it, to speculate upon points of Christian faith and doctrine, which involve man's own salvation, and his being or well-being while here on earth.

On such matters no fact or principle can be admitted without at

once becoming the basis of some important deduction. It may be difficult, at first sight, to point out the exact character or extent of the mischief which thus seeks entrance ; and yet it may be not the less certain that evil must thence ensue.

Is this "Effect of Baptism" here alleged, a nameless, and heretofore unknown thing ; or is it one of the long-established facts of theology, having its name and place in the word of God and in the documents of the Church ?

If it be the latter ;—if it be no new invention, but something long since known and treated of,—then we beg to be directed to those passages in the apostolic writings, and in the standards of our own Church, in which this "dormant seed" is described and named.

But if no such reference can be given,—then what is this fancy to be called, but a *novelty* ; and are not novelties dangerous things in matters of religion ?

We grant that the Romish and Tractarian dogma of the *opus operatum* is here fined down to an exceedingly thin edge. But we cannot feel a doubt that so soon as that thin and almost invisible edge has been safely inserted, it will gradually open the way for the denser and broader statements of Baptismal Regeneration and Baptismal Justification, and of "no change in the state or condition of the soul *but that effected at Baptism.*"

We would intreat those who have adopted this latest—as we cannot but deem it—form of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, to compare, seriously and dispassionately, the third chapter of St. John's Gospel with the third chapter of his first Epistle. In the first of these writings he will find asserted the absolute necessity of being "*born of water and of the Spirit.*" But in the second document we are informed of some of the mighty consequences of being thus "born of God."

"Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not : whosoever sinneth, hath not seen him, neither known him. Little children, let no man deceive you : he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil ; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin ; for his seed remaineth in him : and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil : whosoever doeth not righteousness, is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." (1 John iii. 6—10.)

Now it must not be alleged, that a different class of persons is

spoken of in the Epistle, from those contemplated in the Gospel. The writer is the same; the subject is the same; and the second document only amplifies and explains the first. Let then any man try to adapt the terms of St. John, in his Epistle, to the case and circumstances of *all baptized persons*, and he will at once see in what a difficulty he has involved himself.

“*By their fruits ye shall know them.*” Is it possible to have a more simple or satisfactory test? Following such a guide, and believing that divine grace, when once imparted, *must be* a living, moving, transforming principle, all before us and around us is clear. *He that doeth righteousness, is righteous*, and only he. But the hypothesis of “a dormant principle,” resting upon no divine declaration, is both irrational in itself, and encompassed with difficulties. God does nothing in vain. Least of all does the Holy Spirit create new life, a second, a supernatural life,—without any result following. Yet how many multitudes of poor children perish, between the ages of three and twelve,—baptized, indeed, from mere formality and superstition, but wholly neglected; having never heard a syllable of the Gospel, or read a single page of God’s word. And how can we assert of *such* that “a seed of “Divine grace *has been* conveyed to them,” which “retains its “vitality, and *will* germinate in the quickening beams of the “sun of Righteousness?” Is not this carrying an hypothesis and a charitable hope very much beyond the limits of safety and a sound judgment?

ADDRESS ON SLAVERY IN CUBA, *presented to the General Anti-Slavery Convention*, by R. R. MADDEN, Esq., M.D. London. 1841.

IN the April number of this Review we commented at some length upon the character of American slavery; the materials for the portraiture which we then endeavoured to draw being taken exclusively from American sources. The pamphlet which serves as our text upon the present occasion would assuredly have convinced us of one important truth, if before reading it we had entertained a doubt upon the subject, namely, that slavery, as to all its hideous and revolting characteristics, is everywhere essentially the same. Although reasoning merely in the abstract, from general principles, and not from observation and experience, it might easily have been

understood that irresponsible authority over the lives and liberties of others cannot with safety be entrusted to a being subject to such passions and led by such caprices as is man ; and although there is no authority so truly and practically irresponsible as that which the slave-holder exercises over his victims ; yet persons there were, and probably are still, who really pleased themselves with the idea that the Spanish colonist was an exception to the general law of his kind ; and that in the lovely islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, slavery was but another name for the wholesome restraint which the patriarch exerts over the members of a well-ordered and united household. If into the hands of any one infected with so amiable a delusion these pages should happen to fall, and if he desire to think no worse of human nature (of *Spanish* human nature at least) one quarter of an hour hence than he thinks at present, we warn him not to accompany us a single step farther ; for it is our fixed purpose, with the kind aid of Dr. Madden, to strip away the veil which hides the nakedness of Spanish slavery from view, and give it to the winds of heaven. And truly Dr. Madden is just the man to assist in the achievement of this unceremonious enterprize. He has travelled far, and thought and written much. His feet have trodden alike countries celebrated as “ the cradle of man,” and as the latest conquest of his full-grown strength. He tells us himself that he has “ walked after the hearse of slavery in Jamaica ;” and we know that he had so comported himself towards her, during her dying struggle, as to undergo no suspicion of being chief mourner on the occasion of her funeral obsequies. To crown the whole, he has spent five long years in counting the beatings of her pulse, noting the fading brilliancy of her eye, and (oh shame on the profession) “ taking the measure of her grave in Cuba itself.” He is therefore a practitioner qualified by no common experience to let us into some of the secrets of a lady to whom he has paid, for so long a period, such close and such assiduous attention. And now, Dr. Madden, having thus formally introduced thee to our readers, we call on thee to speak for thyself :—

“ The proposition—‘ That slavery has always had with the Spaniards a peculiar character of mildness,’ is one that I have seen stated in books so often, and heard laid down so frequently by merchants who have resided in Cuba : by naval officers who have visited the shores and harbours of that island ; and by transient visitors who have made tours of pleasure or winter journey, in pursuit of health, from one large town on the coast to another ; and seen the interior economy of one or two estates of opulent proprietors, which in our colonies would be called ‘ crack plantations,’ that I really feel astonished at the amount of error that prevails on this subject—errors so great, and held by men so entitled to credit, that I have sometimes felt absolutely doubtful of the evidence of my own senses, and when *the irresistible conviction of the excessive rigour of slavery in Cuba has been forced on my mind*, and when I have dwelt on the appalling scenes I have witnessed, it often

seemed hopeless to me, and even imprudent, to attempt to disabuse the public mind, and to set my experience against the opinions of many people whose sentiments on any other subject I considered entitled to respect."—(p. 7.)

This, good Sir, is pretty well for a statement of thy patient's case, and we trust that the amiable person to whom in an earlier page we alluded (if undeterred by our well-meant warning he has ventured thus far along with us,) has not failed to mark the words which we have caused thee to pronounce with especial emphasis, by the aid of our *italic* trumpet.

But really we know not that there is any necessity to furnish thee with this soniferous instrument of ours, for upon occasion thou canst employ one of thine own, and speak through it too with the lungs of a very Stentor, as—

"It is not that I have heard or read of the atrocities of Spanish slavery, but I saw them with my own eyes. They astounded my senses. I have already said, and I repeat the words, so terrible were these atrocities, so murderous the system of slavery, so transcendent the evils I witnessed, *over all I had ever heard or seen of the rigour of slavery elsewhere*, that at first I could hardly believe the evidence of my senses."—(p. 9.)

And again :—

"Slavery in Cuba is more destructive to human life, more pernicious to society, degrading to the slave, and debasing to the master, more fatal to health and happiness, *than in any other slave-holding country on the face of the habitable globe*."—(p. 11.)

And now, kind physician, we would have thee a little more precise in describing the diagnostics of this inveterate disease :—

"Instances of cruelty have come to my knowledge, of the murder of negroes, perpetrated with impunity—of men literally scourged to death—of women torn from their children—of estates where an aged negro is not to be seen—where the females do not form a third part of the slave population; nay, of estates where there is not a single female; of labour in the time of crop on the sugar properties being twenty continued hours, frequently for upwards of six months in the year, seldom or never under five, and of the general impression prevailing on this subject, and generally acted on by the proprietors, that four hours sleep is sufficient for a slave."—(pp. 7, 8.)

We will next call upon thee to narrate one or two instances in which thou didst mark the peculiar mode of their development :—

"During General Tacon's administration of the government in the latter part of the year 1837, in the village of Guauabacoa, a league from the Havana, where I was then residing, the murder of a slave was perpetrated by his master, a well-known lawyer of the Havana, whose name I consider it my duty to make known, and as far as lies in my power to expose it to the infamy of a notoriety, which it is not in the power of the shackled press of Cuba to give to it. The name of the murderer is Manchado. The murdered slave of the lawyer Manchado, was suspected of stealing some plated ornaments belonging to the harness of his master; the man denied the charge; the customary process in such matters, to extort a confession from a suspected slave, was

had recourse to. He was put down and flogged in the presence of his master. The flogging, it appeared by the sworn testimony of the witnesses who were present, given before the Commandant of Guauabacoa, a colonel in the army, a gentleman of the highest character, commenced at three o'clock; it ceased at six, the man having literally died under the lash; a little time before the man expired, he had strength enough left to cry out he would confess if they would flog no more. The master immediately sent for the Commissary of Police to receive his confession; this officer came, and stooping down to speak to the man, he found him motionless; he said, the man had fainted. The brutal master kicked the lifeless body, saying, 'the dog was in no faint, he was shamming.' The Commissary stooped down again, examined the body, and replied, 'the man is dead.' The master hereupon called in two physicians of Guauabacoa, and rightly counting on the sympathies of his professional attendants, he obtained a medical certificate, solemnly declaring that the negro had laboured under hernia, and had died of that disease."—(pp. 25, 26.)

And what, good Sir, has become of the gentle lawyer Manchado? Does he pine away under the infliction of unmerited obloquy? or, doomed to silence and solitude, "bloom unseen and waste his sweetness on the desert air?"—

"He moves without reproach in the goodly circles of genteel society at Havana, in that society where the capitalist, who has acquired his riches in the abominable slave-trade, by the especial favour of his sovereign, bears the title of "*Excellentissimo*," where the prosperous dealer in human flesh now retired from the trade, is a noble of the land—where the foreign merchant, who still pursues the profitable traffic on the coast, is the boon companion of the commercial magnates of the place—and where the agents of foreign governments themselves are hailed as the private protectors and avowed well-wishers of the interests of the trade."—(p. 25.)

Well, we shall only say that the company are worthy of one another. It would not perhaps be very easy to match them; yet we think we might possibly succeed amongst the inmates of certain *transport*-vessels which occasionally make a voyage from the shores of England to distant Australia. Undoubtedly people may and do differ in matters of taste; but for ourselves we venture to affirm, that were we required to decide between these Cuba grandees and British convicts, we should find it no easy matter to assign the preference. But Doctor, we forget thee:—

"A case of murder perpetrated on a slave by a white person took place at the Havana in the last year. This crime was committed by an American woman on a poor negro girl, under such horrible circumstances of cold-blooded cruelty, that I doubt if there is any parallel to be found to it in the records of crime in Cuba. The girl that was murdered belonged to a Spaniard of the Havana, who was the paramour of the American. This woman was possessed of property to a considerable amount. She had been long resident in Havana, and was somewhat remarkable for her personal attractions. Her friend, the Spaniard, had sent to her house one of his slaves to assist her, and this girl became the victim of her jealousy, it is supposed—for no other adequate reason has been assigned for the cruelties practised on her. The cries of the unfortunate girl had been heard in the adjoining houses: at length the usual screams were heard no longer, but night after night the sounds of con-

tinued moaning were noticed by the neighbours, and at length they gave information of the matter to the police. The Commissary of Police proceeded to the house of the American lady. On searching the outhouses in the yard, in one of these offices, converted into a dungeon, they found a dying negro girl chained by the middle to the wall, in a state that shocked the senses of all who were present; so loathsome and withal so pitiable an object as the persons who discovered this unfortunate girl never beheld. On releasing her from this dreadful dungeon, where she had been she could not tell how long, it was found that the chain round her body had eaten into the flesh, and the ulcers in it were in a state of gangrene. She was taken to the hospital, and she died there in two or three days' time. If I have added one iota to the truth, or exaggerated a single point in the statement I have given, I am content that every fact I have stated should be disbelieved; but in truth, the horrors of the place, and the wretchedness of the condition in which she was found, are understated. In fact, they could not be described. The monster who committed this murder, when I left the Havana, in October last, was alive and well; in prison indeed, but in one of the halls of distinction, (*salas de distinction*), where the prisoner who has money, no matter what his crime, may always obtain superior accommodation.

"The next case"—(pp. 28—30.)

Hold, Doctor, enough! We are abundantly satisfied—we can endure no more. Although thou sayest—"it is a sickly sensibility which refuses to hear details, however shocking to humanity, that must be told by those who have the misfortune to be acquainted with them, or the wrongs they treat of cannot be redressed,"—although thou averrest this, and averrest it truly, we are nevertheless constrained to plead guilty to the possession of so much of this sensibility (call it "sickly" if thou wilt) as that thy case once proved, our feeling of duty refuses to sustain us any longer against the combined and overwhelming influence of shattered nerves and a sickened heart. We would ask thee two or three questions more, and then thou mayest resume, if it so please thee, thy proper vocation, but oh, as thou valuest thy life, *not in Cuba*. *First*—are these slave murderers ever, that thou knowest, brought to justice for their crimes?—

"During my residence in Cuba, some of the most atrocious murders that I ever heard of, came to my own immediate knowledge; the murders of slaves by their masters or mayorals; and not in any one instance was the murderer punished, except by imprisonment, or the payment of the costs of suit."—(p. 8.)

Good. Well now, how is all this terrible history which thou hast given us reconcileable with the fact—for fact we know it to be—that the laws of the Spanish colonies have a peculiar mildness; that, to quote the language of M. de Tocqueville in his report to the French Chamber of Deputies, "one must be convinced of this on reading the ordinances made by the kings of Spain?"

Come, what sayest thou in answer to this?

"I freely grant that the spirit of these laws and ordinances is humane, but the great question is, are such laws compatible with the interests of slave

owners? Are they put in execution? Negro slavery, as it ever has existed in the West India colonies, has been a condition in which the profitableness to the master of unpaid labour, for the time being, has always rendered the happiness of the labourer, a question of comparative unimportance. What you, sir, would call humanity to the negro, there is not a proprietor in Cuba, who would not deem injustice to the planter. You cannot legislate partially, humanely, and yet efficiently, for any slave-colony in a prosperous condition—you may pass measures of general effect for the total abolition of slavery, but you can carry none into execution for effectually modifying its nature, and leaving unpaid labour to be wrung out of its victims, while a show is made of surrounding its compulsions with humane arrangements, duly detailed in the Royal Cédulas, and set forth in legal books, *with all the solemn mockery of Spanish law.*"—(pp. 6, 7.)

Hast thou aught besides to add on this head?—

"The excellence of the Spanish civil law is admitted by every one, yet the iniquity of Spanish tribunals, the corruption of Spanish judges, and the incomparable villany of Spanish lawyers, is proverbial in all the colonies of Spain. Justice is bought and sold in Cuba with as much scandalous publicity as the bozal slaves are bought and sold in the barraconca."—(p. 10.)

Once more,—wilt thou favour us with a single example of the evasion of what thou callest "the humanity of Royal cédulas?"—

"The Royal law, or cédula of 1789, ordains the regulation of the daily labour of slaves, 'so that it should begin and conclude from sunrise till sunset;' and moreover, should leave them two hours of the intermediate time for their own use and benefit. The (authorized) expounder of the sentiments of the Royal Tribunal of the Audiencia of Cuba says:—'But this is not observed, and neither the magistrates regulate the time of labour, nor do the slaves cease to serve their masters at all hours of the day;' (*Esto no se observa y ni las justicias, ni los esclavos dejan de servir a sus dueños en todas las horas del día.*)"—(p. 15.)

And now that our questions have all been asked, and so satisfactorily answered by thee, we have only to add, that if thou hast any farther observation to make, whether in relation to the general subject, or to its particular details, we will grant thee a hearing:—

"Let me tell you, sir, the same terrible system of cruelty" (which annihilated the aborigines) "is going on this day in the Spanish colonies—the same terrible evils are silently in operation. Change the term Indians for negroes, the word mines for plantations, and in every other respect the same bloody tragedy is acting over again—the same frightful work of extermination, the same cruel mockery of staying the evil by laws without enforcement, cédulas without a hope being entertained of their being carried into effect, is now practising in New Spain, and the same awful waste of human life that in the time of the Indians was for a limited period made up by the ravages of the man-robbers on the coasts of the New World, has now for three centuries been filled up, in Cuba alone, by an annual importation that has now reached to the amount of 25,000 stolen men from the shores of Africa."—(p. 7, 8.)

Christian Reader, we have done with this honest and fearless witness; and now, no longer in the language of banter (though surely not ill-meant banter,) but with all solemn seriousness, we turn to thee. And what can we say so suitable to the magni-

tude of the occasion, as to call upon thee to bless God that thou art a denizen of a nation from whose colonies the last remnant of this accursed system has been swept away, and to tell thee that to gratitude thou art bound to add unwearied diligence and unwearied prayer, till God arise and show mercy to all the nations of the earth, by awakening them to a salutary sense of the horrors and the wickedness of slavery. If thy heart respond not to this call, we can only say that thou art thyself unworthy of the names of a freeman and a Briton,—nay more, that thou art a dishonour to thy faith and a disgrace to thy profession,—that thou hast none of the spirit, and art no true follower, of Him who came from heaven to earth “to break every yoke,” to proclaim “liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.”

A MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND MINISTRY OF THE LATE REV. WATTS WILKINSON, B.A., &c. &c.; *with Extracts from his Correspondence.* By HENRY WATTS WILKINSON, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Gregory and St. Peter, Sudbury; and late Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. London. Seeleys. 1842.

THERE is much in this volume to interest and to instruct the Reader, but very little that falls strictly within the province of the Reviewer. With regard to the prefatory Memoir, the circumstances under which it is published would be of themselves sufficient to disarm criticism—and with respect to the Correspondence, it is clear from internal evidence that the venerable Author wrote from the unrestrained fulness of the heart, never designing or desiring that the effusions of his meek and gentle and unobtrusive spirit should be at any future period presented to the world. Valuable in themselves, their value is greatly enhanced by this simple circumstance. The “*cacoethes imprimendi*” has made in our day such bold and shameless aggressions on the privacy of friendly and Christian correspondence, that no clergyman of any name or note can take up his pen to treat the most sacred and confidential of subjects, even in writing to the nearest relative or the most intimate friend, without the idea of publication ever present to his mind—and, as a natural consequence, instead of inditing an epistle, he deviates into a dissertation or an essay. Such, happily, was not the case in the earlier years of Mr. Wilkinson, and accord-

ingly we have in his letters a treasury of practical wisdom and Christian experience, which it is hardly possible to estimate too highly—expressed oftentimes with a liveliness, a simplicity, and a fervour which bring back the venerable writer to those who were wont to “see his face in the flesh,” and to hear from his lips the *γλυκὴν μέλιτος αὐδὴν* with which, for more than two generations, this Christian Nestor instructed and benefited the Church.

Reverting to the biographical Memoir, however, we are far from implying that it deprecates, though, if it did, it might well disarm criticism. The writer has fully succeeded in the object at which he aimed, which was to afford such a sketch of the life and opinions of his excellent father, as might constitute a proper and useful introduction to the correspondence. With an affection truly filial, he has placed himself altogether in the back-ground; except where his near relationship to the subject of the Memoir finds relief in some epithet of endearment, which reminds us that this touching memorial of a Father in Christ is prefaced by the hand which such a task most befitted,—that of a dutiful and devoted son. We cannot forbear to observe, however, that Mr. H. Wilkinson has displayed no small measure of that “wisdom which dwells with prudence” in his mode of noticing certain extreme opinions which were imputed, by partial judges or superficial hearers, to the Lecturer of St. Bartholomew;—

“Decidedly opposed he was to every statement of doctrine, which he considered as tending to any *antinomian* perversion of the grace of God. Against the unscriptural notion of imputed sanctification, and the opinions of those who deny that the moral law is the grand rule of Christian obedience, with similar tenets, he ever bore a decided testimony. Nor was he less opposed to all those rash, and equally unscriptural statements with respect to the divine decrees, which some have not failed fearlessly and presumptuously to advocate. He never touched upon these *deep things of God*, without the greatest caution and the deepest reverential awe. Hearers he might have had, who were ready to put a *false construction* on some detached passages in his sermons, which might appear favourable to their own views with respect to the points just referred to; or upon some rather strong expressions, which he occasionally adopted, when combating errors of an opposite description. But so far were these tenets from forming any part of his system, that he frequently expressed, not merely his strong disapprobation, but his positive abhorrence of them.”—(pp. 67, 68.)

“In all his ministrations he endeavoured, after the example of his blessed Master, ‘to preach the gospel to the poor’—in spirit;—‘to heal the broken-hearted; to preach deliverance to the captives; and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.’ He aimed, therefore, more especially at dispelling the fears, and encouraging the hopes of all who were inclined to seek the Lord. He taught such as felt an earnest desire after spiritual blessings, that this was a token for good, and an evidence of the work of the Spirit in their hearts. He earnestly intreated them freely to receive what God has promised freely to give. He described the experience of ‘them that are the called according to God’s purpose;’ aimed at strengthening ‘the weak hands,—

confirming the feeble knees; saying unto them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not.' He invited every one that thirsted, to come unto the spiritual waters provided for such; and with joy to draw water from the wells of salvation. He exhorted the weary and heavy-laden to come unto Christ, that they might obtain rest for their souls. 'We have blessedness to speak of,' was a favourite expression with him, when addressing the truly humble and contrite. While at the same time he aimed at the establishment of those who have through grace believed, in their most holy faith, by the constant exhibition of those precious doctrines which have just been alluded to. To these, he constantly appealed, for their support and encouragement, when ready to faint in their Christian warfare. 'This,' he would say, 'is the true grace of God, wherein ye stand.' And he would remind them that 'this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our *faith*:'—that the conflict with indwelling sin would, in due time, terminate in their complete emancipation from the bondage of corruption: and that 'the God of peace would bruise Satan under their feet shortly:'—that He, who claims it as his own prerogative, that 'he changeth not:'—He who is immutable in himself, must be equally so in all his purposes; and therefore will never fail to perfect and *accomplish* the good work of his grace in every one, in whom it is *begun*; consequently those afflictions, to which the children of God are exposed here, 'are light, and but for a moment; and are working out for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.'

That "this witness is true," will be, we are persuaded, fully affirmed by those who are alone competent to judge—the stated hearers of Mr. Wilkinson; those, whose opinion was formed not on a single sermon, but on the annual course, in which he "rightly divided the word of truth," following, like his venerable contemporary at Cambridge, the guidance of the word, whithersoever it might lead him. Accordingly, in reviewing his ministry, during the period of weakness and infirmity which preceded his dissolution, he could look with humble and grateful satisfaction on the consistency which the grace of God had enabled him to maintain. "One thing I am quite certain of—that in all sincerity of mind I have preached what I considered to be the truth. I have been trying to recollect, and do not remember that in any one sermon during my whole life, I have ever disguised my sentiments to meet the prejudices of any one. In looking back upon my ministry, this is the only point on which I can fix with any satisfaction. I believe mine has always been an unvarying statement of doctrine; and that in this respect my first sermon and my last are nearly the same." (p. 50.)

His first sermon—the first, at least, which he preached as an established clergyman of the London diocese—is prefixed to the correspondence, and is, we believe, the only complete and authorized specimen extant of Mr. Wilkinson's discourses. It was preached Nov. 28, 1779, while he was yet in deacon's orders, on the first Sunday after his election to the lectureship of St. Mary Aldermary, an appointment of which he continued to discharge the duties for the almost unparalleled period of sixty years. It will

therefore, as his biographer rightly conceives, be read with much interest by his friends ; and, we will add, with much satisfaction also—for though his later discourses might contain fuller developments and richer expositions and more enlarged and exalted views of the things which accompany salvation, they could hardly embody more clear, accurate, and explicit statements of the first principles of gospel truth. And it shows how far removed he was at all times from what his friend Rowland Hill somewhat whimsically, though not inexpressively, termed a “*sneaking* antinomianism. In this, his first official address to a metropolitan auditory, when insisting upon the duty of searching the scriptures, “They describe to us,” he observes, “the path in which the faithful disciple walks, while they set his divine pattern before us as an example ; require us, if we love Him, to keep His commandments, and in solemn words assure us, that without holiness no man shall see the Lord.—They set before us holiness as our happiness, and heaven as our end.”—(p. 88.)

Such then was the tenor of his first discourse ; and a most interesting anecdote is related in the Memoir, which proves to demonstration the perfect consistency of this good man, and how completely he sympathized with the holy vehemence of Paul, “Do we then make void the law through faith ? God forbid ; yea, we establish the law.” One of his most attached and devoted hearers states (p. 69,) “that he was present at his *last* Tuesday’s lecture ; and seeing the fearful ravages which time was making on his debilitated frame, and being convinced that he had almost finished his work, was anxious to lay hold of something from the lips of so good a man, which he might treasure up in his memory during the rest of his life. And after preaching, evidently with much pain to himself, as long as his feeble frame would allow, he gave utterance to these words, in his usual affectionate manner, with which he concluded—“Remember, *you never can be perfectly happy until you are perfectly holy.*”

After this, who shall say that Mr. Wilkinson ever separated, (however he might be mistaken by some and misjudged by others,) those vital, essential doctrines, which the word of Truth has joined in indissoluble union ; the sovereignty of God’s grace, on the one hand ; the necessity of holiness, on the other. Like the Apostle, he held close to his heart the doctrines of grace ; like the Apostle, he utterly and indignantly repudiated “the unscriptural inferences which many persons have drawn from those sublime doctrines, which he constantly exhibited and appealed to during his public ministry.” An affecting instance of this is given in the Memoir, (p. 53) with which this notice shall conclude.

“ On one occasion in particular, not many evenings before his death, when expressing to one of his sons his apprehension that he should not survive the night, and at the same time his simple dependence on the mercy of God in Christ, as if his mind was still dwelling on these topics, though no one present had attempted to bring them to his remembrance,—he emphatically observed,—‘ *There is no such thing as reprobation.*’ And after alluding to the opinion of President Edwards on that subject, in a manner which plainly evinced the collected state of his mind, he immediately, and with much solemnity and emphasis, quoted the following words: ‘The Lord, the Lord God, *merciful* and *gracious*, *longsuffering*, and *abundant* in goodness and truth.’ ”

But we pause, recommending earnestly the work itself, by which he, being dead, yet speaketh; by which few of our readers, we think, will be ungratified, and from which, we are sure, none can rise unimproved. May these posthumous lessons of wisdom and of holiness sink deep into the hearts of those, upon whom, through so long an interval, his doctrine was wont to drop as the rain, and his speech to distil as the dew; and may they so give diligence to make their calling and election sure, as to be his witnesses in the day of Christ, that he hath not run in vain, neither laboured in vain!

We shall now merely add a specimen or two of Mr. Wilkinson’s correspondence, and close this brief and hasty notice:—

“ I can no longer deny myself the pleasure of assuring you, afresh, how sincerely I esteem you, and wish and pray, that you may in all things be directed and blessed by your covenant God. * * * The latter part of your last letter, I acknowledge, distressed me much. With respect to ‘bidding adieu to the church and its lukewarm, selfish, men-pleasing ministers’—as you style some, whom I cannot but view as the excellent of the earth, and the lights of the world; to whom I esteem it my privilege to look up as examples here, and in whose lot I shall be happy to share hereafter;—I cannot commend this: I do not like the *spirit* which it indicates; I am distressed to read it, and for your *own sake*, I hope, the threat will never be executed. And, how astonished was I at what follows:—‘Twenty-one years of service (you complain *in effect*) has not recommended me, either to preferment or patron.’ My dear friend, were these your objects, when you entered upon the gospel ministry? Are *these* the things which you have been aiming at, while preaching Jesus Christ, and him crucified? Why are you disappointed, why do you complain, if they were not? *No*, they were not your objects—they *never* were—I cannot *believe* that they were.

“ You have the best patron—Jehovah our Jesus, who holds the stars in his right hand; you have the *very best piece of preferment*, which he has, within the reach of his Almighty power and unbounded influence, to bestow upon you; even that in which *He knows* you can serve him best, and that which He pleases. And, I think, I may venture to add, that in proportion as you depart from this simple spirit—‘Lord, condescend to use me for thy glory, but *where* thou wilt, and *how* thou wilt,—anything further will be followed by disappointment and vexation.

“ O, my friend, dread this wish; to be noticed, to be of importance, to be

somebody in the religious world,—suppress and crush it, the moment it stirs. Let us adopt this for our motto, ‘Whose I am, and whom I serve.’—(pp. 240, 241.)

Again, to the same correspondent:—

“Well, my friend, you will obtain a resting place in due time. A rest remaineth for such as you, and such a rest as you will delight in.

“‘They rest not day nor night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty,’ &c. You will then see, that that concurrence of providence which has led you to publish Christ’s everlasting gospel, from north to south, and from east to west, of this highly-favoured isle, was designed for the glory of your great Master, and for your own good. All the vexation you have experienced was necessary; and there is a need-be for all that yet awaits you, till you sweetly sleep in Jesus. Then, these things will have passed away. Wherever your steps are directed, may the blessed Jesus be more and more precious to you; and his finished, free salvation, your constant and delightful theme! We are all—so many—through the great goodness of our God, well. This is a *great* thing to say, and requires great thankfulness. O that I were thankful! My heart feels so just now, and I often *say*, I wish to be so, but my conduct is unthankful. Yet ‘thy ways, O Lord, are not as our ways, nor thy thoughts as our thoughts!’

“This is Wednesday—my evening at St. Antholin’s. Pray that a poor creature may be helped through much work, to God’s glory, and the good of precious souls! O that I could live nearer and more devoted to him, whom I hope I love, and in whom, I am sure, I trust with all my soul, and for a whole salvation, if I trust any where.”—(pp. 249, 250.)

THE END OF 1841.



